# UNITAS

*Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."*
—S. Augustine.

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Association *Unitas*

---

ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

T. Bowyer Campbell: Towards the Chair of Peter.

Emil Herman, S. J.: The Catholic and Dissident Churches of the East.

Nicholas Ladomerszky: The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary in the Russian Church.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS: Archbishop Cicognani, Martin Jugie, Cardinal Agagianian, Cardinal Tisserant, Charles Boyer.

NEWS: Ecumenism, Around the World.

BOOK REVIEWS

---

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

---

VOLUME 1 JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1949 NUMBER 3

*Nihil obstat:*

Charles Boyer, S.J.,

*censor deputatus*

*Imprimatur:*

✠*Aloysius Traglia*

Archiepūs Caesarien. Vicegerens.

*Ex Vicariatu Urbis, die 9 iv '49.*

# Towards the Chair of Peter

This paper undertakes to deal with one small manifestation of pro-Roman effort in the Anglican Communion, namely, the founding and aims of the Confraternity of Unity.

In the English-speaking world, the Anglican Communion occupies a unique and important position. It is a congeries of affiliated churches evolved from a common mother, the Church of England. Its part in America is the Protestant Episcopal Church.

In the 16th century, the Church of England, after a thousand years and more of life and unity with the Catholic Church, was torn away by the Crown from its allegiance to the Holy See, the Divine test and center of unity, and protestantized. This was the Elizabethan Settlement, a compromise and a make-shift intended to satisfy both Catholic and Protestant, therefore a sort of ecclesiastical catch-all. Its character was explained and boasted of as Comprehensiveness, a dubious apologetic.

Comprehensiveness is a breeder of schools of thought running the gamut of fundamentalist Protestantism, liberal Modernism and a final type, an adumbration of Catholicism. In the Episcopal Church, therefore, one can be in sympathy and ideal anything from a Unitarian, Methodist, or like a Roman Catholic.

Comprehensiveness, however, has not always been easy to maintain; groups with strong convictions have become restive and left the Establishment. As early as 1570, the Bull of Pope St. Pius V, *Regnans in Excelsis,* extracted all *bona fide* Catholics and they became known as Recusants. In the opposite direction there were Calvinist and other leakages, creating Dissenters. In the first half of the 18th century, the Methodists went out and set up for themselves. The most recent example of a schism is that strange amalgam known as the Church of South India. In 1833 Catholicism exercised a gravitational pull known as the Tractarian Movement.

Tractarianism, or as it is now popularly called Anglo-Catholicism, has never been able to achieve its aim, namely, to re-Catholicize the Anglican Communion and remotely but logically return it to communion with the Catholic Church. Nor has Anglo-Catholicism been able to extract itself from its matrix, as the Presbyterians and the Methodists did. Nevertheless it lit a Catholic light in English hearts. It has had to content itself with partial successes and explain itself as a Movement.

This Movement is a puzzle to Roman Catholics, who try to write off Anglo-Catholics as apists or accuse them of bad faith. This is over-simplification and at best a bad half-truth. Roman Catholics should give themselves a little more trouble in the matter. The Anglo-Catholic Movement has a character as well as a historical process to be analyzed and understood.

The most significant fact is that this Movement, almost from its very inception, presented its votaries with the inescapable vision of Catholic universality and Catholic unity, both ideals denied to schismatics, and the logical

and natural result has been a continual loss of numbers drained away into the Catholic Church. Rome is a beacon dazzling and attracting, though Newman called it a Shadow.

The attraction is from time to time so strong that when some crisis occurs in the Anglican Communion affronting the presumptions and convictions of Anglo-Catholics, the riper minds, already prepared and conditioned, advert to the Catholic Church. Again, this attraction creates such a hunger that now and then organizations or societies have been formed by groups of Anglo-Catholics to give it formal expression. And sometimes influential individuals, fired with zeal for Anglo-Roman *rapprochement,* have undertaken personal efforts to that end.

The late Lord Halifax was such an one. His association with a French priest, the Abbé Portal, culminated towards the end of the last century in a papal commission to examine Anglican Orders. The commission brought in an adverse report and the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, condemned the Anglican ministry in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae,* 1896.

After the first World War Lord Halifax renewed his endeavors, this time with the sympathy of Cardinal Mercier of Malines. Anglicans and Romans gathered in the Cardinal's house for a series of conferences known as the Malines Conversations. The death of Cardinal Mercier and later that of Lord Halifax brought the Conversations to an end.

But unity was in the air. After the War, the shattered and reeling world cried out for strength through unity. Pope Pius XI asked the Benedictines to form the Monks of Unity. This was done and an abbey established at Amay in Belgium. The special mandate to the Monks of Unity was for work towards the separatists of the East, especially the Russian Church, ground down and suffering under the persecution of Russian Communism. But German Lutherans and Anglicans were attracted by Amay, particularly the Anglicans.

Inspired by the signs of comity and effort towards unity, in 1926, certain pro-Romans in the Episcopal Church organized the Confraternity of Unity for *rapprochement* with Rome. In England, a few years later, the Society for Promoting Catholic Unity came into being. Both organizations are still carrying on their apostolate within the Anglo-Catholic ranks, though many of their members have already entered into their true and secure heritage by coming into the Catholic Church. Others will follow. Yet the actual aim of these societies is not to feed individuals to Rome but to prepare Anglo-Catholics for Catholic sympathies, however, conversion is an inescapable by-product growing out of wider circumstances.

In the summer of 1948, the decennial meeting of the Lambeth Conference took place in London. This conference consists of all the bishops in the Anglican Communion. Though the Lambeth Conference has no canonical authority, yet its pronouncements have the weight of the mind and voice of all Anglicanism.

At this most recent meeting of the Lambeth bishops, the Episcopalian Bishop of Chicago is reported to have said there now existed in the Protestant Episcopal Church no pro-Roman group or movement. Bishop Conkling was mistaken. Or was he wistfully thinking? As said above, the Confraternity of Unity still exists in this country and within the last year the Society for Promoting Catholic Unity has been brought across the seas.

Before being received into the Catholic Church, I myself was a pro-Roman Anglo-Catholic and I was one of the four clergymen to organize the Confraternity of Unity. I think, therefore, that it might be of interest to give a brief account of its formation and early history.

The convictions of us who organized and launched the Confraternity of Unity were twofold: we recognized and deplored the trend in the Anglo-Catholic Movement toward self-sufficiency and insularity, with the emphasis more on the Anglo than the Catholic, because we believed that the true *terminus ad quem* of any effort towards a recatholicizing of the Anglican Communion must be Rome, and more and more Anglo-Catholics seemed to be facing away from the crucial issue of the Apostolic authority vested in the Chair of Peter: and we were alarmed at the inroads liberal Modernism was making in all ranks of Anglicanism. A declaration of ends, that is, 'return to Rome,' would refocus the Movement on the one hand and combat Modernism on the other. Our effort was modest but bold.

In the past several such efforts had been made. There had once been an organization called the Society for Corporate Reunion, but it had evaporated. In 1905, an English clergyman, the Rev. Spencer Jones, preached a sermon, later expanded and published in book-form, called "England and the Holy See," pointing out Rome as the only authority and norm for Catholicism. About the same time, the same clergyman, in conjunction with the founder of the Society of the Atonement at Graymoor, New York (then still in the Episcopal Church, though soon to submit to the Holy See), inaugurated the Church Unity Octave, the annual observance of which later received formal Catholic approbation and is unofficially but widely participated in by Anglicans.

Over the years a widespread acceptance of sacramental teaching and quasi-Roman liturgical practice were achieved by Anglo-Catholics. Their successes expressed themselves after the First World War in the Anglo-Catholic Congress in London, 1920. The Congress organization then became a sort of clearing-house for Anglo-Catholic opinion and work, sustained by continuation committees. In July 1923 a second Congress was held. It was now apparent that the Congress must define Anglo-Catholicism in its relation to the Anglican Communion as well as to the Catholic world in order to free the Movement from a charge of directionless effort and irresponsible eclecticism.

At the first full session of the 1923 Congress, meeting in the enormous

Albert Hall in London, a spontaneous gesture was made that might have committed the Congress, and therefore the whole Anglo-Catholic Movement, towards the Chair of Peter. Frank Weston, the Bishop of Zanzibar, already notorious in the Kykuyu Controversy as a defender of sacramental views against Protestant or Modernist subjectivism, was presiding as President of the Congress. He proposed that the Congress assent by acclaim to various complimentary telegrams: to the King and Queen of England, to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Holy Father, Pope Pius XI. His proposals were enthusiastically supported and the telegrams were forthwith properly transmitted. The following day, the then superior of the Community of the Resurrection, Dr. Frere, later Bishop of Truro, interrupted a formal paper he was reading on the Liturgy to object to the telegram sent to the Pope the previous afternoon. Though a protest was made, the greater acclaim supported the protest.

I was present on both occasions, my approval and joy in the one sadly dashed in the other, for I could conceive of no legitimate ideal or end to the Movement short of return to Rome. But from then on the main core of the Movement seemed committed to self-sufficiency, basing its future on Anglo instead of Catholic, the latter adjective being somewhat less than descriptive or significant.

In 1923, on the other side of the Atlantic in the Episcopal Church in the United States, certain Modernist clergy came forth with a very definite pronunciamento. Conversatives as well as American Anglo-Catholics joined to make a record protest against this sort of Modernism. This took the form of the Priests' Convention in Philadelphia, in the autumn of that year. This was a marked success and an encouragement to us all. Very soon the Americans organized a Congress modeled on the English one.

The Priests' Convention emphasized credal orthodoxy, but it was inevitable that the American Anglo-Catholic Congress would follow the pattern of the English Congress, and there the character of sectarian self-sufficiency had already been stamped on the Movement. This was mere expediency and a move of "springes to catch woodcocks," namely, to make a fresh effort at identifying Anglo-Catholicism with Anglicanism as such. It could only be doomed to failure because of the very Comprehensiveness of which Anglicanism boasted.

At this time I found myself associated with a group of clergy who, like myself, possessed quite other ideals for the Movement. We could only see Rome. We deplored the trend of autonomy in Anglo-Catholicism. We began to meet for informal discussion and exploration of one another's minds. In the spring of 1926, our small coterie gathered at St. Ignatius' Church, West End Avenue, New York. The rector, the Rev. William Pitt McCune, was not present. Perhaps he did not know of the meeting, or if he did, pur-

posely stayed away, though all of us took for granted his sympathy with our point of view.

It was apparent at that meeting that some of the group were merely concerned with matters of ritual and practice and desired whatever efforts were made to be directed towards attaining a greater uniformity in ceremonial, copied, needless to say, from Catholic standards. Some of us were, therefore, dissatisfied with such cloudy matters as our discussion had degenerated into. We found ourselves, like Gedeon's Army, reduced to four, the Rev. Francis Roseboro, the Rev. Sheafe Walker, the Rev. H. K. Pierce and myself.

We four determined to organize ourselves for the express purpose of making articulate our pro-Roman attitude. Soon, however, Francis Roseboro went to Cambridge to try his vocation with the Cowley Fathers which, for the time being, removed him from the three of us left, but his place was soon filled by the Rev. Robert Cornell (now deceased), fellow-curate with Pierce at the Church of St. Mary-the-Virgin, New York. Walker and I were on the staff at Mt. Calvary Church, Baltimore.

We effected our aim in the early fall of 1926, adopting a title, the Confraternity of Unity, and framing a constitution. Article 2 of the constitution read: "The purpose of this Confraternity shall be to promote that movement within the Anglican Communion which looks towards corporate union with the Holy See." Article 3 dealt with credenda. When the constitution was complete, we saw that we had committed ourselves in conscience to the Faith, Discipline and Authority of the Holy See. But what of the attitude of the Holy See towards us and our canonical position in the Anglican Schism? Believing, nevertheless, that by some mystical means we were actually Catholics albeit outside the Roman Church, we were forced to attempt to explain the dilemma in order to justify what appeared to be our inconsistency. This was done by prefixing to the constitution a preamble which read: "The Confraternity of Unity is composed of members of the Anglican Communion who believe that the See of Rome is the center of unity for all Churches. This Confraternity, therefore, seeks through corporate action within the Anglican Communion a basis of reunion with the Holy See which will not be prejudicial to the facts of her sacramental life, and adopts this constitution."

There did not seem to be any particular work that we could do at this time beyond individual study and prayer. Pierce opened correspondence with the Monks of Unity at Amay, in Belgium, and the four of us subscribed to the published organ of that community, *Irenicon.* As opportunity offered we spoke privately on the subject of our aims and ideals to personal friends and were usually surprised to find in them as much sympathy as interest. We even enrolled a few people as members of the Confraternity while we four founders constituted ourselves the Council (an oligarchy pure and simple)

for we were afraid that increased numbers might tend to weaken the bold position we had taken. We were determined to keep a tight hand on the reins.

At that time the Malines Conversations were still in progress. In the spring of 1927 I wrote to Lord Halifax, with no mandate from any Anglo-Catholic agency in America. The tenor of my letter was to the effect that alone of the component parts of the Anglican Communion the Episcopal Church in America was not in British dominions, and that more for the moral effect than for any doctrinal contribution a representative of the Episcopal Church ought to be included in the Conversations. Lord Halifax graciously replied that this aspect of the case had not escaped the Conversationalists and that should a new sitting at Malines occur within the next few months or year, some representative of the American Episcopal Church would be asked to join in the Conversations. This never came about as after the death of Cardinal Mercier the Conversations came to an end.

Another effort of mine also miscarried. That same spring, 1927, I gave an address on Anglo-Roman relations at a meeting of the Baltimore Catholic Club (officially the Clerical Union) in Mt. Calvary Parish. The interest shown in my address was strong. This led on to my being asked to repeat the address before the New York Catholic Club. (Here, I might interpolate that these "Catholic Clubs" were units of an organization, the Clerical Union, purporting to bring together and encourage High Churchmen, but they were in reality rarely anything more than social gatherings.) The meeting took place in Holy Cross Parish, Jersey City. My effort was outflanked, whether intentionally or not I do not know. The then superior of the Order of the Holy Cross, its founder, the venerable and highly respected Fr. Huntington, took the floor first in order to present the cause or case of some priest who had abandoned the Roman Communion and was needing help at the time. This pretty successfully spiked my theme.

In May of 1927, *Irenicon* published a little notice of the organization of the Confraternity of Unity based on the correspondence Pierce had opened with Amay. He had thoughtlessly written on stationery letter-headed for the parish of St. Mary-the-Virgin. *Irenicon* thus naturally identified the Confraternity as springing up in that parish. It is true our early meetings to organize the Confraternity had been held in Pierce's rooms in the clergyhouse at St. Mary's, but the parish had no organic relationship to the Confraternity whatsoever. Moreover, we felt that we had no right to compromise St. Mary's with our blend of thought, or to raise the wrath of the rector, Fr. Barry, against us. On the morning I found this number of *Irenicon* in my mail my eye lighted at once on this item. I showed the notice to Walker and to protect Pierce and Cornell from the very possible ire of Dr. Barry we at once telephoned from Baltimore to New York to arrange for an immediate meeting on neutral ground, neither Baltimore nor New York. The following day Walker met Pierce and Cornell in Philadelphia, but because of some duty

or other, I was unable to go. I assured Walker that anything the three of them did, I would concur in. They decided to issue an official announcement of the existence of the Confraternity of Unity and its aims in the *Living Church,* the principal High Church publication in this country and purportedly sympathetic to the Anglo-Catholic Movement. An announcement appearing in the *Living Church* would be read by all and sundry interested in or associated with the High Church party. It appeared in that paper in the issue dated May 28th, 1927, over the four names of us who were responsible. This announcement we hoped would dissociate the Confraternity from any parish or other organization in the Episcopal Church.

Thus brought out into the open, we rented a post office box at the Baltimore Post Office and invited correspondence. The effect was immediate. Letters, largely sympathetic, poured in from clergy and laity alike. Many persons asked to join the Confraternity. The members of the Council took public responsibility; the list of members was kept secret. By June we printed a circular letter to send to members and friends and I signed the letter (dated Corpus Christi) as secretary of the Council.

In June of that year I went abroad with two purposes in mind: first, to sound out opinion in England with regard to our advanced point of view; and, second, to make a visit to the abbey of the Monks of Unity at Amay in Belgium, with whom we were already in correspondence.

Already a number of Anglican clergy had written to us, notably Dr. S. H. Scott, rector of Oddington near Oxford. Dr. Scott was then seeing through the press his epoch-making study, "The Eastern Churches and the Papacy," by which he undertook to prove from Orthodox authorities alone the acknowledgment of the primacy of Rome up until the Photian Schism, 862. With qualms, because of the accepted party-line, the University of Oxford accepted this work as his D. Phil. dissertation and granted Scott his doctorate.

I arrived in London the last day of the then assembled Anglo-Catholic Congress. I had made an appointment with one of the officials of the Congress, a curate in the famous Anglo-Catholic parish of All Saints, Margaret Street, whom I had been told was vitally interested in reunion. I went at once to the Albert Hall but was told this clergyman (I cannot now recall his name but I think it was Brown) had left town. The next post brought me a letter from him in Oxford and he asked me to come to see him. I went. The meeting was socially pleasant, but fruitless where the definite interest of the Confraternity lay. He felt that first moves should be made towards the Eastern Orthodox, which seemed to me a blind alley so far as the Anglican Church was concerned. But he did tell me about a student in St. John's College who possessed our exact point of view towards Rome, and, moreover, was president of the Oxford Reunion Society. This group met at Pusey House, but we realized later the Society was hostile to pro-Romanism.

After seeing Fr. Brown, I went at once to St. John's but the student, Ivor Thomas, could not be found. I left a note and also wrote to him from London.

That afternoon I returned to London in a downpour of rain, feeling that my visit to Oxford had been fruitless. I do not remember now why I did not try to see Dr. Scott.

Mr. Thomas promptly joined the Confraternity of Unity, our first English member. The following year he entered St. Stephen's Theological College in Oxford and there I visited him and at his invitation gave a talk before the Reunion Society at one of its regular meetings at Pusey House. Dr. Goodge was present and was very weighty and academic. I did not feel my talk had roused much interest. Mr. Thomas ultimately fell away entirely in indifference and secular life.

But I am getting ahead of my story.

In that June of 1927, after a few days in England, I crossed over to Belgium and went at once to Amay. The editor of *Irenicon,* Dom Andre de Lilienfeld, met me at the station. My welcome in the abbey was all that was cordial and gracious. I felt that at last the Confraternity had gained a point of contact with Rome. But this is not the place to speak of Amay. I published an article, entitled "Amay and the Union of the Churches," in the *American Church Monthly,* November 1927, and it was reprinted in *Laudate,* 1929, the organ of the Anglican Benedictines of Nashdom, England. As I was at that time still an Anglican, the article had a considerable bias. Dom Andre entrusted me with promoting subscriptions to *Irenicon* in America. As *Irenicon* was published in French he suggested that the Confraternity of Unity translate any notices or articles pertaining to our special interests and issue them in some publication or circular of our own.

Immediately upon return to this country, towards the end of July, the Council met in Pierce's rooms at St. Mary's, our usual trysting place. The problem of issuing a publication faced us, as a means of answering in a general way our increasing correspondence and as an organ to widen our contacts. A gratifyingly large number of people were joining the Confraternity and we needed to keep in touch with them and sustain their interest.

Consequently, we issued a Bulletin, All Saints' Day, 1927. The firm of Fosnot & Williams, Baltimore, printed it for us and continued to do our printing work for about two years. Later, Baxter's Press, Oxford, did our printing, except for one or two items given to the Rumford Press, Concord, New Hampshire. There were nineteen issues of the *Bulletin,* after which it appeared under the title *Reunion,* and is still issued from time to time by the Secretariat in England (Secretary, Lawrence Edward Jack, Esq., 11 Sandringham Close, Enfield, Middlesex), and is on sale at Mowbray's and Pax House, together with other publications. *Reunion* is fifty cents a copy, but for a number of years the Confraternity distributed its propaganda free, not only

to members but to libraries and influential people all over the world. Some of the material is documentary and as valuable as helpful.

In America, the *Living Church* and the *American Church Monthly* from time to time published articles and book reviews contributed by members of the Council. In the case of the *American Church Monthly,* of which Pierce was literary editor, our endeavor was to give general information, break down anti-Catholic prejudice and get into reviews something of the truth about Rome whenever the subject appeared.

All went well until I sent in a review of a pamphlet epitomizing Dr. S. H. Scott's larger work, "The Eastern Churches and the Papacy." Dr. Delany, the editor of the *American Church Monthly,* pounced upon it as transgressing what he called the Anglo-Catholic Position, that is to say, his conception of a non-papal Catholicism. A stormy contretempts succeeded. My review was rejected even over my protest that reviews of books were not editorial opinions, not even necessarily the ones of reviewers but simply the digest of what writers said, and that scholarship demanded a neutral and impersonal attitude in the matter.

Here I must advance beyond the strict chronology of my theme. In the early summer of 1929, the *American Church Monthly,* as well as the *Living Church* and other Episcopalian papers, broke out into denunciations of the Confraternity of Unity and pro-Romanism in general, pretending to have discovered a plot against the Anglo-Catholic Movement. Dr. Delany was responsible for these public diatribes, which at any rate indicated the non-Roman conception Anglo-Catholicism had embraced and accepted as its character and aim. The Confraternity, in spite of all the publicity and open declaration of its existence, was accused of being a secret and subversive organization, and my name was "dug up" for approbrium though I had never hidden either in writing or speaking and had signed our original manifesto with Pierce, Walker and Cornell, and had also allowed our Corpus Christi Letter (1927) to be distributed over my signature as secretary of the Council. Secrecy was not at all what we wanted: just the reverse, and as for the Confraternity being a mine sowed in the channel of the Anglo-Catholic Movement, we rather conceived of our purpose as being the effort of a tug to draw back into the channel the ship of the Movement which seemed to be drifting off-course.

It was highly amusing, therefore, to learn some months later that Dr. Delany, never a member of the Confraternity, had made his own submission to Rome!

Fr. Pierce supplies the following note: "During my first winter in Rome, when I was still an Anglican and Delany was a student at the Beda, he invited me one day to tea. There was something evidently on his mind, and finally he came out with the following: 'There is something I feel I ought to say to you. I want you to know that *you* had much to do with my being

where I am now. Yes. It is a strange fact that until you and Cornell came on the staff at St. Mary's the Roman question had never troubled me. I took my ideas and convictions from Dr. Barry, and according to him there was no Roman question: Rome's claims were false and unhistorical. Then you two came on the staff, and I found that for you Rome was always the final authority, whether in doctrine or practice. I had never been in contact with Anglicans of that sort. Then you started that Confraternity. I started to think and to study. This was the beginning of my conversion.' "

But again I have run ahead of events.

In the spring and summer, such was the odium Pierce and Cornell had incurred for their pro-Romanism, Pierce's resignation from St. Mary's was asked for by Dr. Barry who produced a copy of the Confraternity's Constitution and called him traitor, and Cornell began looking for another place before the ax, to, fell on his neck. As for Walker and myself at Mt. Calvary, our position there was unpleasantly cloudy. I had begun to write a novel (which Houghton Mifflin published in the autumn of 1928) in order to emancipate myself from parish duty in order to devote myself wholly to work for the Confraternity of Unity, and was enabled to resign voluntarily at the end of the summer, 1928. Walker resigned after New Year, 1929. Both Pierce and Walker possessed their own patrimony, but Cornell and I had nothing. We four were now marked men.

In the autumn of 1928 both Pierce and myself went abroad, I to England and he, with his sister, to Italy.

In England, Dr. Scott of Oddington, whom I have already mentioned, now formally joined the Confraternity, as did the Rev. Morton Howard of Yorkshire, a most clear thinker and eager zealot for our cause. We hoped to secure the adherence of Lord Halifax but he never abandoned his aloof and purely academic position in which he had always moved. For extending our program, the greatest opportunity came from the interest displayed by the Rev. Fynes-Clinton, vicar of the Church of St. Magnus-the-Martyr, London Bridge, where a vigorous Anglo-Catholic work was in progress. After a conference with Fynes-Clinton, the Confraternity effected a formal liaison with the "Catholic League" which had headquarters at St. Magnus'. On Guy Fawkes Day *(pace)*, 1928, I addressed a subsidiary of the League, the Sodality of the Precious Blood, composed solely of clergymen, on the subject of the ideals of the Confraternity of Unity. Signatures for membership in the Confraternity poured in. I went to Oxford and talked to the Reunion Society and visited Dr. Scott at Oddington. I met Spencer Jones and Andrew Acheson, and later Morton Howard and Silas Harris, all of whom became members of the Confraternity. All were advanced Anglo-Catholics and pro-Romans at heart and all prominent and influential in Anglo-Catholic counsels.

Since Pierce and I were both abroad and Walker had retired to his family home in Concord, New Hampshire, Cornell to Point Pleasant, New

Jersey, a responsible person was needed to attend to affairs in Baltimore, where our printing work was done and where the Confraternity had its mailing address. We had asked a young clergyman, the Rev. Wilbur F. Wheeler, if he would serve on the Council, which he kindly consented to do.

In February, 1929, I joined Pierce and his sister in Italy (in the pensione San Girolamo, conducted by the sisters of the Little Company of Mary at Fiesole overlooking Florence and the Val d'Arno). Together we did a great deal of writing to persons interested in our cause, as well as preparation of studies we thought might be useful for publication. Just after Easter, we went for a ten day visit to Rome. Some of the Monks of Unity were residing at St. Paul's-outside-the-Walls and studying at St. Anselm's on the Aventine. We saw them there. We obtained tickets for one of the public audiences accorded by the Holy Father, Pope Pius XI. It was a most impressive experience and filled us with enthusiasm. The following year Pierce was granted a private audience. He was then still Anglican. The Holy Father received at his hands a paper stating the hopes and aims of the Confraternity of Unity.

In June, 1929, we returned to England and Walker came over from America. The establishment of the Confraternity in England was put on a formal basis by the formation of a secretariat at St. Saviour's Presbytery, Northport Street, Hoxton, an outstanding Anglo-Catholic parish with very sympathetic consideration for a pro-Roman orientation. One of the clergy undertook the duties of secretary. St. Saviour's is now no more as it was demolished in the bombing of London during the late War.

During that summer, to all intents and purposes the headquarters of the Confraternity were at Oxford, where we spent several months. Our English membership grew. There was a great deal of correspondence. We held several important conferences, one in Dr. Scott's rectory at Oddington, and one in Worcester College gardens on the Feast of Sts. Peter & Paul, lunching in the house the Pierces had rented, 6 Beaumont Street.

In the autumn of 1929, I followed Walker back to American and lived with him in his own house, 18 Park Street, Concord, N. H., where we established an executive bureau for our work. Pierce rented another house in Oxford, Parkton (I think), and so kept in touch with events in England. We discontinued our Baltimore address in favor of the one in Concord. The Rumford Press printed the *Bulletin* for Epiphany, 1930, and several other lesser publications. We launched an ambitious drive for promoting the Church Unity Octave. Our pronunciamento on that observance, together with the Epiphany Bulletin, was widely circulated not only to members of the Confraternity but to long lists of clergy and all the bishops in the Episcopal Church. More than two thousand copies went out (Bulletin IX).

More and more we recognized that the best operating center for the Confraternity would be in England. In the spring of 1930 I rejoined Pierce in Oxford and to assist in the cost of living accepted a post as part-time

curate in St. Paul's parish, Oxford, where I remained for more than a year.

Our work of correspondence, conference and publishing continued actively. That spring we published (Blackwell) "Catholic Reunion" by Spencer Jones, a thousand copies, half in cloth and half in paper, a copy of the latter being sent gratis to each bishop in the Anglican Communion (except the notorious and recalcitrant Barnes of Birmingham!). As the Lambeth Conference was due to convene in the summer (1930), we wished to present a pro-Roman point of view to the bishops who would attend.

The meetings of this august body are held in Lambeth Palace, the London residence of the Archbishops of Canterbury. The deliberations of the bishops thus assembled are secret until the conclusion of the Conference, then the official report is published. The Conference has from time to time felt concern about a divided Christendom and gone on record as favoring some kind of "union." There was the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral of the early part of the century and another Statement in 1920, definitely saying that no "reunion" was thinkable apart from "the great Latin Church of the West," meaning, of course, the Catholic Church. The pronouncements of the Lambeth Conference have no canonical authority but cannot be taken as anything but the mind and voice of the whole Anglican Communion, for unless the entire Anglican Episcopate is that mind and voice, the Anglican Communion is mindless and dumb as well.

As the date for the meeting of the Lambeth Conference approached, all parties in the Anglican Communion realized how significant this convention of the bishops would be. The principal subject for discussion would be the proposal for the creating in southern India a merger-church, Anglicans with Dissenters. Could Comprehensiveness cover this issue? The Low Church and Modernist parties hoped for a blessing on this scheme from the Conference; the High Church conservatives and Anglo-Catholics feared that the bishops, swayed by the pragmatic advantages of the idea in an important mission field, might compromise on the doctrines of Orders and Eucharist. It would be a very difficult feat to please both points of view. As for any other "betrayals" the Conference might make, none were apprehended.

The Lambeth Conference convened. Conjointly, perhaps as pressure, an Anglo-Catholic Congress assembled at the same time. Apparently the Congress carried little weight with the bishops. On August 15th, the secular newspapers published the gist of what the Lambeth Conference would issue as the official Report. Anglo-Catholic ranks were shaken to their core. In Resolution 42, the Lambeth Conference practically repudiated an apostolic ministry. The way was open for the South India merger, which was consummated in 1947. This pronouncement affecting Orders seemed fatal to all claims of apostolicity, feebly or strongly, according to party, made by the Anglican Communion. But there was matter equally as bad. The Conference gravely compromised the fundamental moral law of Christianity in its resolutions on contraception

and marriage. The bishops revealed their ineptitude as theologians; they vacillated as canonists; they appeared as mere opportunists in policy.

Anglo-Catholics were profoundly shocked. Letters of surprise and dissent began to appear in the newspapers. The Council of the Confraternity of Unity called together a restricted conference to meet in Oxford as soon as possible. The result of that conference was the publishing of a manifesto of dissent in the more important English secular papers, which received wide attention and comment. The signatures of Pierce and myself, as Americans, gave a kind of ecumenical coloration to the protest and was specially noted.

For my part, excuses were out of the question. I knew the character of Comprehensiveness and the temper of compromise, therefore I knew the Anglo-Catholics, however they might search their souls, would soon dismiss the damage done by the bishops by saying that the Lambeth Conference had no binding authority in faith and morals and that the pronouncements of the Conference were merely interesting opinions of a majority of the bishops. Obviously this would side-step the whole issue; the real question of authority would go begging once more, an endless spiral in crisis after crisis. I felt sure that the death blow had been struck to any further belief from me in the specious claims of Anglican parties to a valid authority in faith and morals. I could never again have the least confidence in the Anglican Hierarchy.

Within a few weeks we began to hear of members of the Confraternity, as well as other conscientious individuals, making their submission to the sole trustworthy center of authority for the Christian religion, namely, the Holy Roman Church.

I began most seriously to reexamine my position as a clergyman in the Anglican Church. Pierce did the same thing, and Wheeler in America. Walker showed signs of drifting with the tide. Cornell shut his eyes to the problem. But Pierce and I did nothing precipitantly. I wonder now if we were held back from quicker action by the fact that so many of the most prominent Anglo-Catholic clergymen, particularly in England, men whose sanctity we envied, whose scholarship we respected, and whose sincerity we never questioned, more and more accepted the view that the Lambeth Report was merely an unfortunate expression of opinion to be regretted but not compromising or binding in conscience. Such stalwarts were notably Spencer Jones, Morton Howard, Fynes-Clinton, S. H. Scott, Andrew Acheson and others. But for some of us, the dividing of the path had come; we thought of Newman's great and eloquent sermon on " The Parting of Friends."

Within the next eighteen months or so, however, Pierce, Wheeler and I were received in the Catholic Church (three of the Council of the Confraternity of Unity), and in America alone more than a dozen clergy had taken the same step. How many clergy in England did likewise, I do not know, or how many laymen in both countries, but there were a good many.

Since it was obvious that even the Lambeth betrayal of Catholic prin-

ciples would not extract the mass of Anglo-Catholics from Anglicanism, we, who were leaving the Confraternity of Unity, took steps that a light might remain lighted behind us. The ameliorating work of the Confraternity must not perish. In the early summer of 1931 Walker came to England and we arranged with him that the authority and direction of the Confraternity in England should be taken over by others. After some negotiating this was effected. In America, Walker undertook to carry on alone.

While in many respects, in spite of the War, the work in England has gone forward, maintaining its corporate existence and promoting the apostolate of a Roman end to the Anglo-Catholic Movement. *Reunion* has been published semi-annually. Much of this achievement has been due to the vigorous interest of the now-secretary, Mr. Lawrence Jack. In America, while not extinct, the work of the Confraternity has slowed down and become somewhat passive.

Interest in a "Roman point of view," however, is far from dead in the Episcopal Church and since the Confraternity was lethargic, several Episcopalian clergymen, unable to gain directive control of the Confraternity of Unity in order to revivify its work, have brought across the sea a branch of the Society for Promoting Catholic Unity. This organization was formed some time after the 1930 Lambeth shock by certain members of the Confraternity of Unity, notably Fynes-Clinton and Robert Corbould. I think Silas Harris and Morton Howard joined them too. They thought that some society less exclusively Roman in its orientation and one more devoted to study rather than action than the Confraternity of Unity was needed. They publish a little magazine called the *Pilot*. Its tenor is academic and scholarly.

The work of these two organizations with strong proclivities for Rome must be the subject of prayer "ut omnes unum sint." Through them may many find their way towards the Chair of Peter.

T. Bowyer Campbell

# The Catholic and Dissident Churches of the East

In the days when it was possible to move freely about, the traveller, starting out from Italy or from Austria eastwards, would observe that at a certain point the scene changed, not only in its folk-lore, in the ways and customs of its people, but also ecclesiastically. The familiar church, with its gothic, renaissance, or baroque bell-tower, was rarely met with, or had disappeared entirely. In its stead there rose up everywhere the campanile in byzantine style, with dome in the form of an onion, or most picturesque wooden churches with multiple roofs.

On entering the house of God the eye could not at once freely fix itself upon the altar, the centre of the building, but was halted by the *iconostasis*, a high screen of wood or stone, the masterpiece of an architect, richly adorned with many icons and entirely hiding from profane eyes the sanctuary where the "tremendous mysteries" take place. The priests, with long beards and hair often reaching to their shoulders, in unusual vestments intoned strange chants; the abundant use of incense, the repeated "metanie," or profound inclination of the whole body instead of genuflection, completed the impression of novelty and strangeness: the traveller had reached the land of the Oriental Church.

To help us to understand what this Oriental Church really is, we must first cast a glance at the geographical distribution of Christians of the Oriental Rite. The country which is, on account of the numbers of faithful of the Oriental Rite within it, by far the most important of all, is Russia. The Russian Church, founded in European Russia, has extended its mission over the whole of the vast region of Northern Asia right to the Pacific Ocean and, crossing the sea, has created a dissident Japanese Church, which withstood the trial of the last war, when hostility between Japan and Russia could very easily have caused its destruction. From the south-western borders of Russia the territory of the Oriental Christians extended across Roumania to the Balkan countries: eastern and southern Jugoslavia, or rather, as it was then, Serbia, part of Bosnia and Montenegro, Southern Albania, Bulgaria and Greece. In Turkey, Christians of various Oriental rites are still to be found today at Istanbul, but outside the capital there are none at all. The once flourishing community of Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians are all exterminated, scattered among the Turkish population of the Islands and of Macedonia, or hunted from their dwellings. From the other side of the Black Sea a strip of territory of the Oriental Rite starting from Russian Caucasus passes through the provinces of the north-west of Iran and joins the Arabic countries, that is to say, Iraq, Syria, the Lebanon, Transjordania, Palestine and Egypt. In all these countries Christians of the Oriental Rite are to be found: and here is the territory where Christianity was born and in the first centuries had its major development. Today, on the contrary, oppressed for many centuries

or held under by Islamic dominance, Christianity is the faith of a minority—except in the Lebanon where all the various Christian communities together count among their faithful rather more than half the population—and Christians of the Oriental rite are divided among them in many little groups; while in the European countries, Russia, Roumania, Jugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece, they form the majority, and sometimes a very high majority, of the inhabitants, and nearly all belong to the so-called "Orthodox" Church, except the Catholics of Oriental rite and the Russian sects.

It is needful here to mention three groups of Oriental Christians geographically divided from the principal block of Oriental Christianity: in the first place the Ethiopians, a product of the dissident Coptic Patriarchate of Alexandria, today struggling mightily for liberty; the Christians of St. Thomas, in Southern India, a relic of the great Nestorian missionary activity in Asia during the Middle Ages, but actually mostly Catholics; and above all, the Italo-Albanese who, as successors of the Italo-Greeks of Southern Italy have preserved down to our days the traditions of the Eastern Church in the West, a living testimony of the benign and tolerant attitude displayed by the Holy See towards the Christians of the Oriental Rite. To round off this geographical picture it is enough to record that a goodly number of Orientals for more than half a century have emigrated, chiefly to the United States and Canada, but also to South America and to European countries, especially to France; and this movement has fresh developments following on the upheavals caused by the late war.

Up till now we have been speaking of Oriental Christianity as though it were an homogenous entity, but this is not so in fact: it is variously divided. The first break, and the one that preoccupies us most, is that caused by the fact that a great part, by far the greater part of the Christians of the Oriental Rite are in disagreement, or rather are separated from the Catholic Church; the rest are united to the Church, that is to say, are in Communion with the Roman Pontiff. It will be enough to call to mind briefly the story of this division.

From the very beginning of the Church the Christian Faith had to fight, not only against the polemics of the Gentiles, but also against the heresies that falsified the Word of God taught by Jesus Christ. The Hellenic and Oriental religions with their mysteries and the Greek philosophy were too deeply rooted in the hearts of the people to give place quickly and wholly to the new religion; very many people sought to combine the old and the new piety. The special influence of Greek philosophy made itself still more felt when, in the fourth century, persecution ceased, and the great mass of the subjects of the Roman Empire entered the Church, now become the favorite of the Emperors. Recent research of an Hungarian scholar shows most clearly what part was played in the birth of Arianism and in the Christian struggles

that followed by Aristotelism and Platonism, and this last especially under the name of Neo-Platonism.

The greater part of these heresies disappeared, leaving no trace. But when in the fifth and sixth centuries dogmatical quarrels found ground ready prepared by the division between contrasting nations and cultures which existed among the Byzantines and the ancient peoples of the East (Syrians, Copts, Armenians, etc.), these religious differences led to the formation of dissident Patriarchates which endure to this day.

It was thus that Nestorianism came to birth and was spread so widely for several centuries in Turkestan, in India, and in China. So also arose the Monophysite Churches in Syria, Egypt and Armenia.

But in the Catholic Church herself the contrasts between East and West have gone on widening and deepening. Under Justinian, at the beginning of the fourth century, in Byzantium the Latin language was still the official language of the law and of the army—the great codification of this Emperor preserves today the original Latin language. However, towards the end of the century and in the reign of Heraclius the Greek language came to the fore and dominated everywhere. But it was not to be expected that the Latins would understand Greek. Note the example of St. Gregory the Great himself who, although for several years *apocrisiarius,* or Papal Legate, at Constantinople, never learned the language of the country.

Deeper still was the cultural contrast between Byzantine refinement, carried down traditionally from the ancient Greek-Roman culture, and the Western peoples, barbarized as a consequence of the invasions of the Germans but full of the promise of new life and youthful ardor. Political divergence between Italy and Byzantium and the proclamation of Charles the Great as Emperor deeply wounded the Byzantines. And the reflowering of ever new heresies at Constantinople, encouraged by the Emperors, had had the effect of producing temporary schisms and of weakening the sense of unity between Rome and the Orient.

Misunderstandings augmented friendly relations became more rare, until in 1054 the Patriarch Michael Cerularius could provoke by his anti-Roman attitude that breach that remains unhealed.

One consequence of the schism of the Byzantine Church was that the other Churches turned toward the new Rome and the separation from ancient Rome widened. Attempts to reestablish unity between Rome and the Orient are not wanting. The most important among them is the union effected by the universal council of Florence (1439). While however none have arrived at being actual on account of the opposition of the people stirred by the Bishops and monks to resist union, a certain number of partial unions have happily been effected. In this way, side by side with the separated Churches now existing in the East, Catholic Churches of the various Eastern

rites flourish, preserving their ancient traditions, their particular discipline, and especially their ancient worship.

We give now a rapid glance at the actual state of the various groups. Among the dissident Churches that have been longest in existence the most important is that which calls itself the Orthodox Church because it pretends to have always preserved the true faith (orthodox). Separated, as we have said, from the Catholic Church since the eleventh century, it will not admit any dogma defined in recent times by the Supreme Pontiffs or the Councils, as for example, the Immaculate Conception and the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

This separated Oriental Church is composed of a certain number of Churches which are autocephalic or independent each of the other, recognizing only the Ecumenical Council as a superior authority, which, as a matter of fact, has not been convened since the year 787. They bury the visible unity of the Church in the uniformity of faith, of worship and of ecclesiastical communion. Among the heads of these independent Churches the Patriarch of Constantinople occupies the chief place, having what is called a primacy of honor; after him rank the most ancient Patriarchs, of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, then the more recent Patriarchs of Moscow and of all Russia, of Roumania, and of Serbia, the Exarch of Bulgaria, the Metropolitan of Greece and the heads of the lesser Churches.

While the separated Byzantine Church embraces a considerable part of the Christianity of the world (an accurate calculation is impossible in the present state of the world: it is supposed to be about 135 millions, with roughly 100 millions of those in Russia), the Nestorians today are a little community living in the North of Iraq, in the neighboring provinces of Iran, and in Malabar. They are said to number about 85,000 souls.

The Monophysites today are grouped in the Coptic Patriarchate of Alexandria, from which depends that of Ethiopia, in the Patriarchate of Antioch in Syria and in the *catholicossati* and Armenian Patriarchates of Etchmiadzin, Sis, Jerusalem, and Constantinople.

The number of Monophysites is estimated to be actually 8 million, of whom half are Ethiopians, two million and a half Armenian, and a million Copts.

Among the Eastern Catholics the most numerically important group is that of the Ruthenians, with three dioceses in Galicia, two in sub-Carpathian Russia, one in Jugoslavia, and seven Bishops in the United States and Canada. The religious persecutions let loose by the Bolsheviks have destroyed the exterior framework of this flourishing Church, whose dire vicissitudes have been related by the Holy Father Pius XII in his Encyclical *Orientales omnes*. Her Bishops, many of her priests and of the faithful can be truly called confessors of the Faith, and also, without prejudice to the judgment of Holy Church, martyrs. We cannot stop here to consider more in detail

the other Catholic Churches of the Byzantine rite( Greek, Roumanian, Melchite, Bulgarian, Italo-Albanese); those of the Alexandrian rite, the Copts, who have had for a year a new Patriarch of Alexandria in the person of His Beatitude Marcos II, and the Ethiopians; the Catholics of the Antiochian rite: the Maronites, bulwark of the Catholic Faith in the Lebanon; the Syrians, whose Patriarch is His Eminence Cardinal Tappouni; the Malankaresians, the most recent Catholic rite that arose with the return of the Church of Mar Ivanios and his faithful; the Catholics of the Armenian rite presided over by His Eminence Cardinal Agagianian; and the Catholics of the Chaldean rite in Iraq, Iran, and South India. In all they number about nine million.

We have looked at the picture of the dissident and Catholic East. The Eastern Catholics generally have a flourishing religious life, their priests are better trained than those of the separated Churches, their faithful are constant in their faith and in their attachment to the Roman Pontiff. But their numbers are small in comparison with those of the dissidents: nine million Catholics in comparison with 135 million of separated Easterns. The sorrowful question arises: why is this? Why have the generous, constant efforts of many centuries not been able to restore unity? Why has no better result been attained?

The obstacles against which have been shattered all attempts at unity consists, one is constantly told, in divergences of belief. The dissident Eastern reject the formula of the *Filioque* and, on the contrary, insist on the assertion that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; they require leavened bread for the Most Holy Eucharist; they believe that the Sacrifice of the Mass is completed by the words of the *Epiclesis;* they will not admit the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, at least, not his primacy of jurisdiction: here is really the rock most destructive to unity. Not that it is needful to insist on these differences, generally well known, it will be more useful here to touch on some less known points which perhaps have been less well weighed in considering the question of the reunion of the separated Orientals.

Since the divergence between West and East does not end with the few points above indicated, but is concerned with the entire conception of the Church, of life, of the world: to neglect these aspects of the question of union would be, so to speak, risking a superficial conception of the whole problem. What we shall say possibly does not refer to the whole community in the same way or to the same extent: but it will be true for those who wish to look at the separated Orientals in a general way. As regards the Catholics, our observations are valuable up to a certain point; they have however undergone in many ways the influence of the Latin world. As regards the rest, the Oriental point of view is often quite as well founded as that of the Latin, provided we do not exaggerate it. Divergence of view-point, of attitude and of usage does not destroy the unity of the Church, provided that unity remains within just limits and on the foundation of revealed Truth.

1. *Hierarchical Government.* At the time of the birth of the Church, all the Mediterranean world was united under the dominion of Rome: unity of government to which corresponded unity of culture, of intellectual and artistic life, of commercial interests, such as had never before been united thus and never would be again. This was a factor of immense importance in the development of the world and of Christianity. There remained, however, in this unity of government and of culture a great difference between the Western part of the Empire and the Eastern part. In the West, Rome, the capital, ruled incontestably even in matters of culture, in all the provinces civilized by her; the Latin language was used everywhere, Latin literature was the only source of all education and of every science, everywhere Roman institutions, Roman customs prevailed. In the Orient, on the other hand, Greek culture had certainly subjected to itself the ancient Empires, but under the brilliant Hellenistic varnish the old Oriental civilizations continued to live, and very rapidly the Syrian, Coptic, Armenian, and other literatures rose again, and there was not, as in the West, one single center of irradiation, but the great cities of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, rivalled one another. We see the same difference in the Church. In the West, Rome was the one great center of supereminent authority, the city of the two greatest of the Apostles, Peter and Paul. All the Churches of the West sought to trace back their origin in one manner or another to Rome herself. The Latin language alone was admitted to the Liturgy and to the books of the Church. In the East, instead, from the very first centuries the Churches began to group themselves as regional organisms, in provinces. The Council of Nicaea in 325 supposed already the existence of Metropolitan government, and of a government still wider, very soon known as Patriarchal, which even today remains as the most original contribution of the constructive Oriental ecclesiastical thought. It is very much later before Metropolitans make their appearance and, if it is true that the Bishop of Rome was designated Patriarch of the Occident, such a concession would be rather an artificial creation, most probably the work of the Emperor Justinian desiring to enshrine the Roman Primate in an order of things really entirely different. Using an image we can say that according to Roman ecclesiastical thought the Church of Rome is the foundation on which the other Churches are erected to compose together the Church of Christ. According to Eastern ecclesiastical thought the Roman Primate is the keystone of the arch that gives the ultimate union and ultimate perfection to the whole mass of individual Churches already grouped in provinces and patriarchates, but all resting their foundation on the Corner-stone, which is Christ. A double aspect of the mystery of the Church that excludes no one, but which carries within itself the consequence of differing conceptions of several moot points.

2. *The Church and the National State.* In the East just as in the West the Church has rejected and refused to countenance the sometimes high preten-

sions of the State authority to mix itself in matters of faith or worship. But in the vast camp of questions in a wider field the attitude of the Latin Church and that of the Oriental Church has been extremely diverse almost from the beginning. While the Roman Church, conscious of her Divine authority, has always laid claim to full liberty in the religious field, and also in worldly matters when such liberty is necessary for her work, the Oriental Church has shown herself much less bold in face of the secular powers. The Orientals have often reproved in the Roman Church the warlike spirit which seemed to them so alien to the mildness of Christ. But it cannot be denied that the flexibility of the Eastern Hierarchy towards the rulers of the State has led not seldom to a condition of servitude of the Church which even the dissident Eastern authorities lament. Especially notable is the example of Peter the Great of Russia who abolished the Patriarchate and erected in its place the Holy Synod, an organ strictly watched over by the *Supreme Procurator,* a layman and the lieutenant of the Emperor. And in the other dissident countries things are not much different. Whilst after the first World War, in Roumania and Serbia, new Patriarchates were erected, the whole ecclesiastical ruling was voted by the Chamber and promulgated by means of State laws. A few years later, the Serbian Diet threw out a matrimonial code which ordered religious matrimony, fixed matrimonial impediments according to ecclesiastical law, and the celebration in Church of matrimony. As regards the dissident Orientals, the State stabilizes the fundamental laws of the constitution of the Church, mixes up in everything, and, to the damage of religious life, in all ecclesiastical matters the influence of the Church is made to serve the ends of the State. One must, however, recognize on the other hand that the intimate conjunction of State and Church does in general preserve the Oriental from those sad conflicts between religion and legitimate love of country. But the Catholic finds the price he has to pay for this concord between national feeling and religious feeling far too high.

One consequence of this close bond between nation and Church is that religion and nationality become practically identified. Perhaps I may be permitted to mention something which happened to me personally fourteen years ago. I had arrived at Chisinau (Kishinev), the capital of Bessarabia, which after the first World War passed from Russian to Roumania. I took a carriage, and ordered the coachman to take me to the Catholic Church. He, visibly embarrassed, began to drive me about the city; took me first to a Protestant Church to see if that would please me, then began asking me questions as to what this thing a Catholic Church could be. Evidently I had used a name that meant nothing to him. Then all of a sudden he exclaimed contentedly: "Ah! It is the Polish Church you are wanting!" And he immediately drove me there. This typical fact shows how in Russia, Catholic and Polish, Orthodox and Russian are identical synonyms. It is easy to understand what an obstacle this mentality is to conversion. According to the common

idea the Russian who becomes a Catholic ceases to be Russian, loses his reason, denies his country. The same thing may be said for the Balkan countries. There are many emigrants who live ten years in Italy or in other Western countries, esteem the Catholic religion, and assist now and then at Mass, but who cannot find the courage to take the decisive step, because they judge that in so doing they will cut themselves adrift from their country. There is for them only one religion, and it is precisely this precious bond that ties them to far-off Russia.

To judge this attitude justly it must never be forgotten what historical importance the separated Oriental Church has had in the religious and national life of the people. If the Greeks and Slavs of the Balkans have preserved their nationality during the long centuries of Turkish domination they owe it to their Church which in those centuries was the one only center round which revolved all their life, religious and national. This gives it a title to gratitude which the Oriental could not easily forget and which it would be imprudent and unjust to try to deny.

For others as well as for Eastern Catholics the belonging to a fixed and durable religious community has an importance unknown in the West. In the Lebanon, for instance, the number of seats in the Chamber to which the various religious communities have a right is determined by the Constitution of the country. So many seats are assigned to the Maronites, so many to the Melchites, so many to the dissident Greeks, and so on. Who could imagine in the West a Parliament in which seats were dealt out by the Constitution on religious grounds, so many to the Catholics, so many to the Calvinists, so many to Presbyterians, so many to Jews! Such a situation is the result of Arab and Turkish domination; Islam, whose sacred law is at the same time a religious and a State law, could not apply their laws to non-Mohammedans. But neither could they contemplate a government run by the State alone. Therefore they recognize in every religious community an authority similar, though limited, to their own. Conditions peculiar to the East justify institutions that elsewhere could not exist. It is not possible to judge the East by Western standards.

3. *Piety*. The piety of the Oriental is a dogmatic piety: profoundly nourished by the great truths of the faith. Dogmas such as the Most Holy Trinity, of the Incarnation and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, or of the divinization of man by grace, are the themes that return continually in the prayers, hymns and in all the sacred poetry that holds so large a place in the Eastern liturgy. The veneration of the Holy Spirit is not a devotion reserved for certain classes, but is diffused everywhere among the most simple of the faithful. While in the West Mary comes represented sometimes as the Most Pure Virgin, sometimes as the Mother of God, in the East she appears only as the latter. She is never to be seen without her Divine Infant. Idylls such as those painted by Raphael and those of the German and Flemish Masters would

be in the East impossible. Worship clothes the Madonna always with her solemn mantle.

In the second place Eastern piety is liturgical. While in the West a sturdy flowering of devotion has grown up beside the Liturgy, so much that every time perils arrive the minds of the faithful turn to these devotions and indeed often substitute them for the principal act of worship, in the East the Liturgy still preserves its unique and exclusive place.

Moreover also, in the celebration itself of the Mass there is notable divergence between the Latins and the Orientals. A private Mass or Liturgy does not exist, or, at least according to the ancient rule still preserved in great part among the dissidents, it does not exist. One single Altar is to be found in the Church and one single Mass is celebrated there daily. To be able to celebrate the Holy Mass every day is for the Catholic priest so great and consoling a privilege that he would not renounce it for any reason whatever. But nevertheless we must confess that this gathering of the whole parish round the one, only Altar of the Church in order to take part in the Sacrifice offered by the whole ecclesiastical community in marvellous unity of spirit and of prayer has such a profound significance and is so faithful to ancient traditions that we understand well how the Orientals hold closely to this usage. It could be added that in the East the people take a much more active part in the sacrifice than they do in the West, at least in Masses that are not Solemn. There are those who would obtain the dialogue Mass here among us, in the East it is always there and alive. Priest and choir, deacon and people, all contribute their share during the ceremony of the Sacred Rite.

While speaking of Oriental piety it will be licit to allude briefly to the cult of the icons. In comparison with Protestantism which, especially in its beginnings, showed itself definitely iconoclastic, Catholics and the Eastern dissidents are in accord in admitting the cult of images. This fact, however, must not be mistaken. In their approach to the essence of the cult East and West divide. To Westerns the image is the representation of the person in whose form it is made; it reminds us of the person, it stimulates our affection towards him or her. To the Eastern the sacred icon is much more; it is a representation but it is a symbolic representation, a symbol; that is to say, it does not aim to put before our eyes the exact form of face or figure which represented the man during his lifetime, but by means of a form more or less abstract we are lifted up to the glorified life of the Saint and put in contact with him.

According to Eastern theology, original and copy, prototype and image are not two completely divided realities; in the copy we lay hold of the original, in the image the prototype; therefore the image is actually a part of the prototype. We discover here the profound influence of Platonism which has remained always alive in the Oriental conscience. Therefore the cult of the image signifies much more for an Oriental than for a Western:

it is a real contact with the supernatural world. The East was aware of this difference when Charles the Great and his theologians in the Council of Frankfort showed themselves unwilling to accept the definitions of the Second Council of Nicaea, and censured it. The Holy Pontiffs, however, take up the defense and vindicate the orthodoxy of the said Council.

4. *General conception of life and of the world.* The Western Church, like the Eastern Church, knows that this world passes away very soon, that true life only begins in the other world, that the fatherland of Christians is only in Heaven. But till death there is no passing over, the Christian lives on this earth and, faced with the world and its good things, it is possible to have a double attitude.

The Christian can fix his gaze on the transitoriness of this life and on the precarious nature of its goods, may despise all that is passing and dedicate all his efforts exclusively to the attainment of the eternal goods. Or else he can recognize also in the world the Creation of God which is destined to serve God and to glorify Him and apply himself to directing everything towards that end. The attitude of the Eastern Church is prevailingly eschatological. She strives against evil, but more often still decides to support with patience what she believes herself not to have the power to fight, consoling herself and her faithful with hope of the world to come. While the Latin Church in hard and bitter conflict is striving to impose upon the Christian State her standard of just social order and of the sanctity of matrimony, the East submits passively to the strength of the State as if she saw herself not only up against it, but also up against inveterate uses and abuses, as, for instance, divorce.

The same divergence is manifested in the conception of religious life. The Orient has never known, like the Latin Church, apostolic religious orders, active and combative—we are here thinking of the knightly orders. The monk who leaves this world and all the things of this world, is the only form of religious life admissible; and, notwithstanding St. Basil and his preference for the cenobitic life, for the Oriental the true ideal always remains the hermit, who, separated from the vicissitudes of this Earth, lives all alone in the contemplation of Divine things. While in the West we find several grades of religious; with temporary vows, with simple vows, with solemn vows—the legal Latin mind distinguishing clearly each group according to the obligation it assumes—the East knows one only and identical religious profession. They did indeed admit a second grade, but that was choice of a life still more retired. The monks, after a long time of experiment and proof, in place of the *microschima* or "little habit" received at profession, could be clothed with the *megaloschima,* or "angelic habit"; a habit which does not carry with it any new legal obligations, but is the solemn expression of the proposal to lead a life of maximum solitude, of constant prayer, and of great mortification. In reality the seculars also

aspired to this kind of life, and if, at the hour of death, they were clothed in the monastic habit, it was because they could not conceive of any form of perfect life except that of the monk.

We could add other points of difference between East and West. But all I have said is enough to give an idea of the divergence which, so far from being superficial, is profound and owes its existence to the widely differing mentality of the Eastern Christian from that of the Western. It is not a question, evidently, of establishing a scale of values and of giving preference to one form of worship and discipline rather than to another. Provided that it remains within the limits of truth and within the ambit of the Church, both forms of Christian life are legitimate. Even more, all Christians should understand and admit and appreciate such varieties of attitude and of custom; because such things constitute the riches of the Church just as the varieties of the theological schools and of the schools of asceticism and mysticism of the different Religious Orders. If this could be well understood, the divergence would no longer be a scandal but a fount of great esteem and love among Christians.

Those who see and know the great number of the Orientals who are separated from the Church of Christ cannot remain indifferent. One cannot but hope for their speedy and universal return to the Fold of the Saviour. Union, it is true, will be made only in the truth. It is not possible to trade or to haggle with Divine revelation. But sometimes in history one has sought to abolish, in the name of pretended exigencies of truth, legitimate customs which have been preserved with the approbation of the Holy See. When, then, the dissidents shall be persuaded that their return to the Catholic Church will not entail the banishment of their traditional mentality, an inheritance from their holy Fathers, or the relinquishment of their legitimate customs, a great obstacle in the path of reunion will be eliminated. Let us pray then that not only may our separated brethren give up the prejudices that they have against the Church, but that, as the Holy Popes have so often inculcated, Catholics also may better understand Eastern things, in order that there may come swiftly the triumph of Truth in Charity.

EMIL HERMAN, S.J.

# The Dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary in the Russian Church

The writings of contemporary Russian theologians leave one with the impression that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary had never been accepted in the Russian Church. But this is far from the case. The Russian Church descended from the Greek Church, and inherited from it not only the whole complex of its rite, but also the totality of Christian belief, including its Mariological doctrine.[1] Indeed the Russian Church manifested unanimous belief in the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception up to the second half of the seventeenth century when hostile foreign infiltrations began to oppose it. A brief examination of the dogma's history in the Russian Church will favor a just appreciation of its present denial of a doctrine which it once affirmed.

*I. Testimonies of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception among the Russians.*

The period between the time of Russia's conversion at the end of the tenth century[2] and the first half of the seventeenth century comprises an explicit admission of the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God. Evidently, we should not look for mature theological treatises in the more remote times, for they were not formally developed until the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We find the affirmations of belief in the Immaculate Conception among the sermons, homelies and in the liturgical writings in large part translated from the Greek.[3]

Toward the middle of the sixteenth century, the Metropolitan Macarius (1542-1564) united all these writings in a large collection called *Tcheti Maria* which contains "all the holy books and the edifying writings which existed in Russia in that time." The various writings are arranged according to the order of the Calendar. The collection contains both original writings and translations from the Greek which were in wide circulation and which were used by the Priests and the faithful. We find there, among other things, the homelies of St. Andrew of Crete and of St. John of Damascus. Here the Marian privilege is always affirmed. Nowhere, however, is the doctrine contradicted. If then none of the holy writers opposed what was declared therein on the Immaculate Conception of Mary, it must be concluded that this doctrine represented the unanimous faith of the Russian Church up to the time of Macarius.

In the Liturgy of the Russian Church we find also a constant and continuous affirmation of this dogma. The office of December 9 is outstandingly rich in resplendent descriptions and poetic acclamations with regard to the

1) Cf. N. Ladomerszky, *Il domma dell' Immacolata Concezione di Maria nella Chiesa Greca dopo la separazione*, Unitas, vol. II, 1947, pp. 183-200.
2) Cf. A. M. Ammann, S.J., *Storia della Chiesa Russa*, Torino, 1948.
3) Martin Jugie, art. *Immaculee Conception dans l'Eglisee grecque apres le Concile d'Ephese*, in Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, vol. VII, col. 969-974, gives a summary description of the principal facts on the Immaculate Conception in the Russian Church.

Mother of God conceived without sin.[4] Here the magnificent purity of Mary is celebrated. She is continually called "holy," "most glorious," "sole immaculate." "The choir of the prophets has foretold long ago a pure and immaculate Virgin," we read in the liturgical office, "the sterile Anna conceived you, you whom we sing with joy, we who have been saved through your intercession, you who are the *sole immaculate*."[5]

A Church which unanimously sings in this fashion is unable logically to teach that the Virgin was conceived in sin. The original stain is unthinkable where an unlimited purity exists.

If we pass from the simple affirmation of the faith to the doctrine of the theologians, our satisfaction will be no less. First of all the Academy of Kiev, the principal center of culture, interests us. We have a study of Fr. Gagarin of the Company of Jesus on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.[6] It would be impossible to cite here all the theologians of Kiev who have taught the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. It suffices to say that beginning with Peter Moghila (1596-1647) until Stephan Javorski (rector of the Academy of Kiev from 1727 to 1731), that is, until the middle of the eighteenth century, the rectors and theologians of this superior school of theology clearly taught the privilege of Mary's exemption from original sin.[7]

If we go from the south to the west, to White Russia, we find the same affirmation of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. As a very characteristic example, we cite the excerpt from the formula of consecration which was made by the confraternity of the Immaculate Conception of Polotsk. In consecrating themselves to the Mother of God, they professed: "I promise to honor, all the days of my life, your immaculate and most pure conception."[8] This is a testimony of faith which admits of no refutation or negation.

Also in Muscovy in the course of the seventeenth century we have clear testimonies of the acceptance of the Immaculate Conception. The most important is that of the year 1666 when the Bishops at the Council of Moscow approved the work of Simeon Polatski *Zezl pravlenia* (Rod of Direction) where it is said textually: "Mary was exempt from original sin beginning with her conception."[9] In the following year, the great Council of Moscow, with the two oriental Patriarchs present, again approved the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

---

4) The Russian Church as well as the Greek Church on December 9 celebrates the conception of St. Anna when she conceived the Virgin Mary.

5) *Siedalen*, after the second Cathisma.

6) P. Gagarin, *L'Eglise russe et l'Immaculee Conception*, Paris, 1876. This is a translation of the original Russian published in 1858. One should add Martin Jugie, *L'Immaculee Conception chez les Russes au XVII siecle*, in Echos d'Orient, vol. XII, 1909, pp. 66-75; A. Palmierie, *Theologia Dogmatica Orthodoxa*, vol. I Firenze, 1911 pp. 153-156. In the manuscripts of the Academy of Kiev one often finds the monogram of the Immaculate Conception, V.M.S.L.O.C. (Virgini Mariae Sine Labe Originali Conceptae). Cf. S. Salaville, *La croyance et le culte de l'Immaculee Conception chez les Grecs et les Slaves au XVIIe siecle*, in *Marianum*, vol. II, 1940, pp. 256-283.

7) Cf. Malvy-Villier, *La Confession Orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila*, Orientalia Christiana, vol. X, n. 30, p. XV: "Sur bien des points controverses entre l'Orient et Rome . . . sur l'Immaculee Conception . . . les docteurs de Kiev penseront comme les Latins."

8) C. Goloubiev, *Explanatory Paragraphs on the History of the Southern Russian Church* (in Russian), in Trudy (Works) of the Academy of Kiev, 1904, pp. 464-467.

9) *Zezl Pravlenia*, Part I, ans. 10.

But from whence arises this unanimity of affirmation on the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary? Did the Jesuits of Poland, perhaps, influence the Russian theologians to profess the Catholic doctrine? Is it then that Catholic influence is the principal motive and the cause of the unanimous manifestation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary in the Russian Church?

It is absolutely impossible to admit that the influence of the Jesuits of Poland caused the Russians to confess unanimously the Immaculate Conception for more than a century. They admitted it, Father Gagarin says, "because they judged it to be in conformity with their own traditions, and because they found testimonies for it in their own liturgical books. We should not deceive ourselves—the Academy of Kiev was in open war with the Polish Jesuits."[10]

These unanimous affirmations of the Marian privilege soon met with opposition which developed gradually and became more general. The foreign infiltrations explain the cause and give an idea of its historical and theological progression.

### *II. Opponents of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception among the Russians.*

This unanimity in the profession of the Immaculate Conception of Mary was interrupted in the second half of the seventeenth century. The Patriarch of Moscow, Nikon, wishing to reform the liturgical books of his Church, requested the counsel of the Patriarchs. These sent him, among others, the book of John Nathanael entitled *The Divine Liturgy with Explanations of the Different Doctrines.*

Nathanael, administrator and secretary of the Patriarch Jeremia II, had made a part of his studies in Germany and in England. For a long period he was curate at the Greek Church of St. George at Venice. His book dates from this period. It is a compilation of texts and explanations of the Holy Liturgy taken from the Byzantine liturgistes. At the beginning of his work he states that he had utilized all the important sources, such as Germanus of Constantinople, Simeon. the New Theologian, Nicholas Cabasila, Theodore of Andida and others, Ἅγιοι διδάσκαλοι τινῶν. Nevertheless it is patent that the ideas put forth in his book are personal. For example, when he interprets the beautiful hymn θεόν Ἐστιν which is sung directly after the Epiclesis, and in which Mary is called "more honorable than the Cherubim, incomparably more glorius than the Seraphim, she who has virginally generated the Divine Word," Nathanael observes that the purification of the Virgin from the original stain was effected only at the moment of the Annunciation.

The book of Nathanael was soon translated into Slavonic under the title of *Skrigeal* and was approved by the Council of Moscow in 1667. The Immaculate Conception of Mary is manifestly denied in that book. The Mother

10) Gagarin, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

of God, it is said there, through a special privilege of God, was purified of original sin at the moment of the Annunciation. But this doctrine did not penetrate into the Russian Church without provoking very strong resistance.

There was strong opposition on the part of those who refused to accept the liturgical reforms of the Patriarch Nikon. Preserving the ancient faith, these called themselves *Starovery,* that is Old-believers. Being persecuted by the Czarist regime, the *Starovery* established an episcopal see in Bukovina at Bela Krinitza. The professor Soubbotine in writing the history of this diocese cites a passage from the profession of faith made by the *Starovery* in the year 1841 which reads: ". . . the Mother of the Creator of the whole universe, not only has in no way participated in the orginal stain, but she ever remained as pure as the heavens and all beautiful."[12]

This resistance was not, however, sufficient to check the spread of this denial of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, nor to impede a change in the ancient traditional teaching.

In the second half of the eighteenth century the doctrine of Theophane Prokopovich, which was imbued with Lutheranism, gained ground in Russian theology. From that time on the manuals of the seminaries looked to this celebrated theologian of Kiev for their ideas. The denial of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary thus penetrated into Russian theology.

It is true that in the past century we witness the existence of more moderate tendencies. For example, Anthony Amphitheatroff[13] takes up the idea of Gregory Palamas on the progressive purifications of the ancestors of Mary. Already in Abraham's time God had chosen the generation of the ancestors of Mary who were then progressively purified.[14] This theory, even if somewhat strange, preserves in some way the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

After the definition of 1854, there were many attacks upon this dogma. The greatest theologians, however, as Father Jugie observes,[15] such as Philaret of Moscow, Macarius Bulgakov and Philaret Gumilevski, observe a profound silence on the question of the Immaculate Conception.

In the second half of the last century, the monograph of Lebedev[16] presents an attack against the definition of Pius IX. Father Jugie has analyzed this study at length.[17] Lebedev pretends to present his own theory as the traditional doctrine of the Byzantine Church. Mary was born, according to

---

Cf. N. Ladomerszky, *Il domma dell' Immacolata Concezione di Maria nella Chiesa Greca dopo la separazione,* Unitas, vol. II, 1947, pp. 193-197.

12) M. Soubbotine, History of the Hierarchy of Bela Krinitza (in Russian), Moscow, vol. I, 1874, p. XLII.

13) A. Amphitheatrov, *Dogmatic Theology of the Oriental Orthodox Catholic Church* (in Russian), Moscow 1848, Greek translation of Theodore Vallianos made in 1858.

14) *Idem,* Greek translation, pp. 190, 191 ff.

15) Martin Jugie, art. *L'Immaculee Conception dans l'Eglise grecque apres le Concile d'Ephese,* Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique, vol. VII, col. 972.

16) A. Lebedev, *Differences between the Oriental Church and the Occidental Church on the Doctrine Relative to the Most Virgin Mary, Mother of God. On the Immaculate Conception.* (In Russian) Warsaw, 1881, 2nd edition, St. Petersburg, 1903.

17) Martin Jugie, *Le dogme de l'Immaculee Conception d'apres un theologian russe contemporain,* Echos d'Orient, vol. XX, 1920, pp. 22-35.

him, as other men in original sin. She was sanctified when she conceived Jesus. However, she acquires total purification only at the foot of the Cross of her Divine Son. This theory leaves many points obscure, as for instance whether or not Mary had committed actual sins after her sanctification. Nevertheless, the doctrine of Lebedev did not fail to produce a strong influence upon the Russian theologians.

In 1884 the Holy Synod of the Russian Church placed the question of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception on the list of polemical questions. From that time the negation of this dogma is almost unanimous on the part of the Russian theologians.[18]

### *III. The Most Recent Situation*

In recent years the theological thought of the Russian Sergius Bulgakov has aroused wide interest. He has published various studies on Mariology, in which is found some originality as well as certain curious tendencies.[19] Perhaps the most important among these works is *Kupina Neopalimaja,* or the *Incombustible Bush.*[20] Here Bulgakov's doctrine shows a sophianic foundation and special anthropologico-soteriological concessions on the origin of man, original sin and the restoration of the first order made by Jesus Christ. In the first part of the work the positive sanctity of Mary is dealt with. Several chapters are devoted to the preparation on the part of God of the Virgin for the divine maternity, the cooperation of the chosen people, her sanctity from the first moment of her existence, and finally Mary's progress in sanctity.

A treatment of Mary's negative sanctity is found in the second part where the author studies the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. He uses various arguments in an attempt to refute the Catholic doctrine. The text reflects a polemic and contradictory tone when speaking of the inopportuneness of Pius IX's definition as it does in developing the other arguments. Bulgakov's most interesting arguments are those in which he compares Jesus Christ, Eve, St. John Baptist and the whole of mankind with Mary, Mother of God. He argues that if the Virgin cannot equal her Son, neither can she be free of original sin as He was. All other men were conceived in original sin, wherefore Mary cannot be free of it.

Fr. B. Wynnyczuk in a doctrinal dissertation which he presented at the Pontifical University of the Propaganda Fide, makes a thorough analysis of and response to the *Kupina Neopalimaja.*[21] He writes the following as a conclusion: "Bulgakov denies the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception as it is taught by the Catholics. However, when he attacks our doctrine he is following the line of hostile aversion to the definition made by the Sovereign

18) Peter Svietlov makes an exception when he declares that this doctrine "is born of a good source, in a sentiment of profound veneration for the Mother of God." Moreover, he asks what council has condemned the doctrine of the Latins as a heresy. *Christian Doctrine from the Apologetic Point of View* (in Russian), 2nd ed., Kiev, 1910, vol. I, p. 190.
19) *Light of Twilight* (in Russian) Moscow, 1917. *Friend of the Spouse* (In Russian), Paris, 1927. *Jacob's Ladder* (in Russian), Paris, 1929.
20) Edited at Paris in 1927 at the IMCA-Press.
21) B. WYNNYCZUK, Doctrine Sergii Bulgakov de positiva et negativa sanctitate B. Mariae Virginis (pro mss.), Romae, 1944.

Pontiff which is common to all the dissident Orientals, rather than opposing the doctrine which it contains. He opposes the doctrine with arguments which are above all theologically false. They are imbued with Protestant and semi-rationalist principles, and are colored by his personal views. He opposes the traditional doctrine of the state of original justice, of the fall, and of grace. He has not dared to oppose it explicitly with the Scriptural, Patristic and liturgical arguments employed by the Catholics to support the Immaculate Conception, but he has preferred to hide them behind a veil of profound silence. All his difficulties . . . have already been resolved by our theologians."[22]

We find that a wide variety of systems are used today by the Russian theologians to oppose the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Some profess the purification at the moment of the Incarnation, others embrace the theory of a purification at the foot of the Cross of Jesus, while others accept the recent theory of Netharius Kephalas which would have a purification in the maternal womb. It is most evident that confusion on this doctrine reigns among the Russian theologians.

One thing which can be placed beyond doubt is that the negation on the part of the Russians does not repose upon traditional doctrine, but finds its motive principle in the spirit of polemic contradictions which the Churches separated from Rome characteristically manifest before all that the Roman Pontiff has defined.

May the Virgin Mary, Mother of God and Mother of men, obtain from her Divine Son that He dispel this aversion of the separated brothers for His Vicar and for the sublime doctrine of her own Immaculate Conception.

We are all united—both Catholics and Oriental dissidents—in the prayer: *Sub tuum praesidium confugimus, Sancta Dei Genitrix,* which the Latins conclude with the invocation *Virgo gloriosa et benedicta* and the Russians with the glorious exclamation *sola pura et sola benedicta!*

NICHOLAS LADOMERSZKY

---

22) Op. Cit., p. 233-234. Practically summarizing his doctrine on the Immaculate Conception, Bulgakov expresses himself thus: ". . L'Eglise orthodoxe n'admet pas le dogme catholique de 1854, le dogme de l'Immaculee Conception de la Vierge, en ce sens qu'elle serait exempte du peche originel a sa naissance. Mais l'Orthodoxie n'admet dans 'l'Immaculee' aucun peche individuel, car cela ne responderait pas a sa dignite de Mere de Dieu." *L'Orthodoxie,* Paris, 1932, p. 165.

# Comments and Documents

## *EASTERN RITES AS BONDS OF UNITY*

The reflection of the Church's divine unity in the diversity of its resplendent rites was clearly described in a sermon of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Amleto G. Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, delivered on the occasion of the Episcopal Jubilee of His Excellency, the Most Reverend Constantine Bohachevsky, Apostolic Exarch for Galitians of Byzantine Rite in the United States, held at the Ukrainian Catholic Seminary at Stamford, Connecticut, on June 26.

The Apostolic Delegate, speaking to a great gathering of faithful assisting at the sublime celebration of the Byzantine Liturgy, remarked that the beautiful Slavonic rite carried them into the atmosphere of the East, homeland of Jesus Christ, "where both sun and stars shine so refulgent as to bring us directly into the presence of God."

Turning his sermon toward the eminently Christian task of accomplishing the Divine Master's will "that all may be one," he said:

"A solemnity such as this offers a welcome and propitious occasion to recall, among faithful of different rites, their common interest in the East, to consolidate amongst us Catholics the fraternal bond that unites us, and also to turn our thoughts charitably to the faithful of the separated churches.

"*One is the Church of Christ:* one in faith, in Sacraments, in moral law; not Latin or Greek or Slav but Catholic, founded on the rock which is Peter, 'with Jesus Christ as the chief cornerstone' (Eph. 2,20); spread throughout every corner of the world, embracing all peoples . . . one, holy, catholic, apostolic. Since the descent of the Holy Ghost in the Cenacle, evangelization began—'Their voice has gone forth into all the earth' (Rom. 10,18)—and so it is obvious that there would be a variety of customs, traditions, and tongues. Calling all the peoples to follow Christ, the Church welcomed them as they were, molding each and all with His grace."

The focal point was the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Together with unity in the essential elements, it was only natural and in harmony with the peculiar genius of each people that there be a diversity in prayers, ceremonies, chants and dramatic parts. Thus the rites were formed . . . "around a Rite, as a vital nucleus, there are revealed and incorporated the characteristics of a people, and their qualities; in a rite there are sculptured, as it were, their discipline, their history, their genius; hence a rite, in the religious sense, is a sacred symbol of one's own people and nations, and a banner of faith and of love for one's nation. To the rites are linked venerable names, such, for example, as that of St. Mark coupled with the Alexandrian rite. Rites are therefore sacred memories and traditions, testimony to their early Christian origin; they are consolidated within the legitimate jurisdictional divisions, and the hierarchic heads of these centers or 'metropoles,' the Patriarchs of Antioch, Syria, Alexandria in Egypt, Jerusalem and Constantinople, have

become the custodians and moderators of their respective rites . . . with these rites are intimately connected tens and hundreds of millions of brothers, those namely of the separated churches, due to that unfortunate separation which took place in the middle of the eleventh century. They belong to us because they are brothers in Christ, and they are united to these nine millions of (eastern rite) Catholics in their respective rites; through their rite they have in common their origin, language, traditions, and customs. Oh what many and what provident means to help overcome the difficulties of return; certain it is that the rites will be the highways by which they will return to the unity of the Church, and they will not suffer any kind of embarrassment for they already know the rites and belong to them. Indeed the Church wishes that such way remain open and intact, preserving their integrity and beauty. The Supreme Pontiffs on every occasion have proclaimed it to be their firm will that the rites be preserved and held in high honor."

* * * *

## *PREAMBLES OF UNION ACCORDING TO A GREEK BISHOP*

The *Embros,* an Athens newspaper, published in its Sunday issue of April 10, 1949, an article signed by His Excellency Panteleimon, Bishop of Chios, which merits the attention of our readers. As a title, it bears our Lord's words, *that all may be one.*

After recalling the prayer of our Lord at the Last Supper, and certain formulae from the liturgical books of the Byzantine Church for the union of the Churches in God, wherein the bread and wine of the Eucharist serve as symbols of fraternal union, His Excellency Panteleimon proceeds:

"A fanaticism which is opposed to the principles of Christianity maintains the two ancient Churches—the Catholic and the Orthodox—separated. This fanaticism has opened a terrible breach. It has made a mountainous barrier of divergences whose import is slight, and which existed even before the hateful schism occurred, when no one gave them any attention. Fanaticism embitters the heart, arouses hate and precipitates revolt. When fanaticism is extinguished, then our eyes will see things differently, and a bridge will be built over the abyss. Charity will cast its magnetic power into Christian hearts, and unite them one with another, and there will be realized the desire of the Lord *that all may be one.*

"Fortunately the dawn of this great day has begun to show its light. First of all, the very holy Pope Pius (XII), in fraternal words, announced his election as Pope of the Rome of many martyrs and the friend of martyrs to the Ecumenical Patriarch, who responded, he also in a fraternal tone. When I read of this event in the newspapers, I wept from the depths of my heart. I found therein the sweetly moving hope that the ice was about to be broken.

"In his turn, the new Ecumenical Patriarch, His "All Holiness"

Athanagoras, announced his election to the Pope with fraternal affection and comprehension. The same Patriarch sounded the alarm to all Christian Churches, exhorting them to intensify their efforts to unite and make a common front against the fearsome enemy which is named the Antichrist of Communism. Behold the dawn of a great day which will not deceive.

"Come, my very dear friends, come and let us unite all our prayers for the early coming of the blessed day! May we all understand, may the world understand that the Antichrist is the enemy of our happiness in this life, and of our eternal salvation in the next. Let us from this time on drive out of our hearts the fanaticism which has blinded us, and which has hindered us from perceiving the true light of our Christian faith. The Antichrist of Communism threatens to extirpate that which is the beauty of life and to rob our souls of their salvation. Let us all unite, Christians, at least before this fearful danger. Let the most holy desire of Our Lord be realized at least now."

His Excellency Panteleimon's words are truly worthy of a Christian heart! If we divest ourselves of all polemic spirit, on one side as well as on the other, unity will soon be a reality. With more prelates of the Bishop of Chios' sort, the breach of separation will soon be filled.

MARTIN JUGIE, A.A.

* * * *

## SEE OF PETER, SEAT OF UNITY*

*(continued)*

St. Gregory the Illuminator and other Fathers of the Armenian Church read and commented upon these passages of the Gospel with a spirit free of prejudice and a humble heart—indispensable disposition if one would listen to God! They have left admirable testimonies to Catholic faith which fill our hearts with ineffable joy and peace, and they authorize us to declare that we are the veritable heirs of their faith.

In the writings of Agathangel, our historian of the fourth century, we read the following words which had sprung from the lips of the holy Illuminator: "Our beneficent Lord and Redeemer, Son of God, the Christ, asked who men said the son of man was. When they (the apostles) had replied, he continued: 'but you, who do you say that I am?' The first among them, Peter, responded: 'Thou art the Son of the living God.' This is why he was declared blessed. 'Blessed art thou, Peter, son of Jonas,' he said, 'because thou hast not received this knowledge from thy parents, nor from thy people, nor from men, but the Father has revealed it to thee.' And He made him the rock of stability of all the Churches." (Agathangel, Venice, p. 339-340)

*Pastoral Letter of His Eminence Cardinal Gregory Peter XV Agagianian, Armenian Catholic Patriarch of Cilicia. The body of the Pastoral Letter is being printed here in installments, of which this is the second.

But could it by any cause be that our holy Illuminator did not also reckon the Church which he had founded among the Armenian people as being among the number of "all the Churches" and this in the first place?

In the *Hadjakhabadoum* (collection of sermons, p. 163), our holy Father Gregory the Illuminator says again, "In the Gospel the Lord says to Peter: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church' that is, the people believing in God, 'and the gates of hell will not prevail against them, those whom thou wilst have loosed on earth will be considered truly holy and just in heaven, and the evil and unjust whom thou wilst have bound upon earth, will be bound in heaven to undergo chastisements."

Could it be, by any chance, that the Armenian people whom the holy Illuminator had engendered in Christ should nor make part of the people believing in God, and who are in the true faith? Yet for this, according to the very words of the holy Illuminator, one must be founded upon Peter and be loosed by him.

The Patriarch St. Sahag (4th cent.) in his turn furnishes an eloquent testimony in his *Book of the Canons*. These are the words of the great Armenian pontiff: "One sole Lord, one sole faith, one sole baptism: and whoever wishes to say that they are many wishes evidently to say that the faith is multiple. The Law of God does not teach us of a church made of stones and wood, but it shows us the human race founded by the faith upon the rock of stability. Therefore, the true faith is the Church which gathers us together and amalgamates us in the unity of the knowledge of the Son of God. The Vivificator in person teaches us this in saying to Peter: 'Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church and the gates of Hell will not prevail against thee.' But what should one understand by rock? Will it be a piece of stone? By no means, but he will be a rational man, head of the Apostolic College, who, because of having believed and confessed with an unshakable faith Christ the Son of God, was proclaimed blessed and was named Peter (rock). Therefore, those who have been built upon him are not stones, but men participating in his faith. . . ."

Eznik of Kolb (5th cent.) has St. Paul speak thus: "Not only I, the last of the apostles, who have been worthy of contemplating this mystery, not even Peter, *the head of the Apostles,* would be able to speak of it if he saw Him."

The Father of our historiography, Moses of Koroun (5th cent.), has St. Peter say, "Since I have been honored by Him (Christ) with the primacy, to the degree that I am the first among the first, I shall arrive at the summit of perfection, and I shall carry the keys of Heaven, and I shall be the foundation of the Church."

It must be said that it was during this fifth century that the Armenian people really lived its golden age—a golden age of culture. It was then that the alphabet was invented, a translation of the Bible made, which should be

described as the queen of translations. It was a golden age of pure patriotism which should find its halo of immortality in the war of the Vartanantz at the heroic battle of Avarayr in 451. It was a golden age of religious fervor and ecclesiastical life in Catholic unity through the clear profession of the primacy of Peter who is "the first among the first," charged with "carrying the keys of heaven, and being the foundation of the Church."

Of course, these writings of the golden age are not within the reach of all. Yet our Fathers have made this evangelical profession to resound publicly today and always, in the Armenian Churches. On the occasion of the Feast of the Princes of the Apostles this hymn is sung: "Lord, who have designated the Blessed Peter first among the Apostolic College, head of the holy faith, foundation of the Church, invincible by the gates of Hell . . ., who have promised to give to blessed Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. . . ."

Such was the faith of our Fathers, such is now the faith of us Armenian Catholics. Those who feel shocked by these expressions of our Fathers of the golden age or who give them tortuous interpretations—in the intention of eclipsing the brilliance of their light—must avow that an abyss stands between them and their ancestors.

* * * *

Christ charges Peter to confirm the faith of his brothers: "strengthen thy brethren."

Here we are at the last hours—hours full of mystery—which Jesus passed with His apostles at the Cenacle before His death. His soul is flooded with sadness at the thought of imminent suffering, of the betrayal of Judas, and of the abandonment of His apostles. Even Peter will deny Him. At this moment Jesus speaks to Peter alone: "And the Lord said, 'Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren." (Luke 22,32)

In repeating twice the name of Simon, the Lord Jesus calls Peter by his former name as if to recall his human weakness, proper to him insomuch as he has not yet received the Holy Ghost. Then He adds that Satan, the adversary, has ardently desired to sift the apostles like wheat, through temptations and persecutions. Jesus has permitted him this so that His apostles might become aware of their weakness through their own experience. Christ had, though, already prayed especially and uniquely for Peter that his faith fail not (notwithstanding the triple fall which was about to occur through the personal denial), and Peter, once again strengthened, will strengthen his brothers, the other apostles, so that the Church will remain invincible in spite of the gates of Hell.

* * * *

After His Resurrection, Jesus realizes His great promises when He says to Peter, "Feed My lambs—feed My sheep."

Peter and seven other apostles are near the beach on the Lake of Genesareth. Jesus appears to them, talks with them, and "when . . . they had breakfasted, Jesus said to Simon Peter, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love me more than these do?' He said to Him, 'Yes, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' He said to him, 'Feed My lambs.' He said to him a second time, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love Me?' He said to Him, 'Yes, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' He said to him, 'Feed My lambs.' A third time He said to him, 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love Me?' Peter was grieved because He said to him for the third time, 'Dost thou love Me?' And he said to Him, 'Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee.' He said to him, 'Feed My sheep.' " (John 10,16)

Here also Jesus speaks to Peter alone, calling him by his former name. In compensation and reparation for the triple denial, He demands and receives from Peter a triple expression of love which exceeds that of the others; and He commands him to feed His lambs and His sheep, that is to say that He makes him shepherd of the whole flock. According to the holy Fathers, Peter should feed not only the simple faithful, "My lambs," but also the apostles, "My sheep," and not only the flock then present, but also that which was to come concerning which Jesus had said: "And other sheep I have that are not of this fold. Them also I must bring . . . and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." (John 10,16)

St. Eghichius (5th cent.) in his discourse on the preaching of the Apostles, interprets this passage in this wise: "Since the flock is one, and one the shepherd, the pasture is one and one the sheepfold, and there are the lambs and the sheep and the whole multitude which He has called His flock, even, indeed above all, the apostles whom He confided to Peter."

To feed an intelligent flock signified teaching its doctrine, nourishing it with affection, defending it against evil and dangers, directing and guiding it, in short, doing all that is necessary for the government of this flock, that is, the sole and universal Church of Christ.

There are numerous passages in the Gospel which explain and mutually corroborate each other. They alone suffice to prove the Catholic doctrine concerning the Primacy of Peter.

But how not to thank the adorable Heart of Jesus! Foreseeing how many assaults and denials this fundamental structure of His Church would meet during the course of the centuries, He benignly willed to multiply the proofs. He has presented this doctrine under different eloquent and moving comparisons, and has declared it with glowing clarity. He has made it so evident that a Catholic would be in his right if he were to say to Christ, "Lord, if the impossible has happened, if there is error in our Faith, it is You Who have led us into it."

The singular and privileged position of Peter among the twelve apostles is clearly deduced not only from the solemn testimonies which we have just

cited, but as well from a number of other passages of the Holy Gospels.

In the list of the Apostles, for example, Peter is always named first: "first Simon, who is called Peter" (Matt. 10,2; Mark 3,15; Luke 6,14 ff), while the other apostles are not always mentioned in the same order.

Sometimes the Apostolic College is indicated thus: "Simon, and those who were with him." (Mark 1,36; Luke 8,45)

Let us now pass to that live and fascinating first history of the new-born Church, the Acts of the Apostles. In this inspired book we soon discover that here also the Apostolic College is shown under the guidance of Peter: "Peter . . . with the Eleven" (2,14); "Peter and the apostles" (5,29). Moreover, Peter, in this exceptional position and in his conduct, worthy of a true head, conscious of his charge, acts as a supreme pastor of the young Christian community. He declares authoritatively that the number of the apostles must be completed, and sets down the conditions of candidacy. All the electors acquiesce humbly (1,15). It is he who speaks in the name of the apostles on the day of the Pentecost (2,14 ff). He teaches the new religion and receives the thousands of Jews into the Church. It is he who, for the first time, judges and punishes Ananias and Sapphira (5,3 ff). When the number of the faithful began to multiply in Judea, Galilea and Samaria, it is Peter who makes a pastoral visit (9,32). He first received from Heaven the order to admit Gentiles into the Church and baptize them (10,5). Peter presides at the Council of Jerusalem—he speaks first, resolves the problem in question, and declares that the converted pagans are not held to observe the Mosaic law. The whole assembly is silent in sign of assent. (15,7).

We may conclude with St. Francis de Sales that "If this does not mean being the first and head of the apostles, I confess that the apostles are not apostles, the pastors not pastors, nor the teachers teachers. What more explicit words and marks could be used to signify a pastor, a teacher, an apostle than those which the Holy Ghost has put into Scripture to denote Peter as the head of the Church?" (Controverses, art. 7)

* * * *

After he had founded the Church of Rome and had definitely established his See there, Peter finished his career with a glorious martyrdom, according as his divine Master had foretold him. He was crucified with his head downward at Rome during the persecution waged by Nero against the Christians in the year 67. He was also buried at Rome, as many testimonies and the unanimous tradition of the Church from the first century attest.

This tradition also existed in Armenia. It was known there that the tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul were to be found at Rome. The father of our historiography, Moses of Koroun, says: "Although we desired to sail towards Greece, the violence of the wind bore us to Italy, and greeting the land where St. Peter and St. Paul repose, without staying long in the city of the Romans, we passed from Hellas to Attica and remained at Athens."

Should the character and charge of head "of the whole Church" confided to Peter by Christ cease with the death of Peter? Certainly not. The Church is, as we have said above, through the will of Christ, universal, perpetual, and instituted for all times and for all peoples.

But if the Church is to last until the end of the world, how is she to subsist without her foundation stone? How is she to open the gates of the Kingdom of Heaven without him who is charged to use the power of the keys? How is she to guide and feed the lambs and the sheep in the pastures of the authentic faith without the direction of the supreme shepherd?

Yes, Simon son of John is dead, but Cephas-Peter is immortal and he renews himself ceaselessly in the person of the Pontiffs of Rome from century to century, through the most glorious and the most admirable succession which history has ever recorded.

At the Eternal City, within the marvelous basilica dedicated to St. Paul, one may contemplate a glorious illustration of Peter's succession in the Roman Pontiff. A series of splendid mosaics picture the Popes who followed one another in uninterrupted succession from St. Peter, the first Pope, down to Pius XII, now gloriously reigning. Under different names—Linus, Clement, Silvester, Leo, Gregory, Pius . . . two hundred and sixty-two Popes form the golden chain of almost two thousand years. In them the Christian world has always recognized Peter-Cephas, who, still today, holds tenaciously to the profession of the Divinity of Christ with all its consequences, just as in the time when, through celestial revelation, Simon, son of John, proclaimed it at Caesarea Philippi. Peter-Cephas is, in his successors, in our day as well, the head of the faith, the foundation of the Church, the embattled object, always triumphant, of the attacks of the gates of Hell. He declares to atheistic and erring humanity that Christ is "the stone that was rejected . . . which has become the corner stone. Neither is there salvation in any other." (Acts 4,11) He stands as defender of human liberty in the face of every sort of tyrant, and he cries to them: "We must obey God rather than men." (Acts 5,29)

From the first century of the Church, the Roman See has shown itself conscious of its supremacy, not because Rome was the capital of the Empire, but because it was the See of Peter. Moreover, all the other Churches recognized in Rome—we say it once more—the "See of Peter."

Even those persons who are not well versed in ecclesiastical literature, patrology and history, know that there are many facts and testimonies proving our point of view. A mere enumeration of these facts and assertions would lead us too far for this occasion. It will suffice here to pass in review the declarations of certain Ecumenical Councils where the voice of the universal Church made itself heard.

It was the Roman Pontiff who presided through his delegates over the Ecumenical Councils held from the first centuries in the Orient, and which were composed almost entirely of oriental Bishops and Fathers. His Primacy

was recognized by all, without any opposition or objection. From time immemorial it has been declared that the Primacy is held by the successor of Peter.

This we find unanimously admitted by the Fathers of the third Ecumenical Council of Ephesus in 431, in the time of St. Celestin, Pontiff of Rome: "no one doubts, it is even evident in all ages, that the holy and blessed Peter, head and prince of the apostles, pillar of the faith and foundation of the Catholic Church, has received from Our Lord Jesus Christ, from the vivifying Saviour of mankind, the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and that the power of absolving and of binding sins has been given to him. *It is he who until today and always lives and judges through his successors.*"

Everyone knows well that the Bishops representing the Armenian Church assisted at the Council of Ephesus, as well as at the preceding Councils of Nicea and of Constantinople.

At the fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) after having heard the *Letter of Pope St. Leo the Great,* condemning the error of Eutyches, the Fathers present declared unanimously, "Such is the faith of our fathers, such is faith of the apostles. We all believe thus, thus believe all the faithful. Anathema to those who do not believe. *Peter has spoken through the mouth of Leo.*"

At the third Ecumenical Council of Constantinople (680), in the time of Pope St. Agathon, the Fathers wrote to the Sovereign Pontiff: "After having read the letters of Your Paternal Blessedness, which we venerate as if written by the supreme Head of the apostles, we commend ourselves to You, as to the pastor of the first See of the universal Church to do that which is necessary, to You who stand firmly upon the unshakeable rock." Then they all affirm: "*Peter has spoken through the mouth of Agathon.*"

Just as they had admitted the Primacy of St. Peter, our Armenian Fathers also saw the continuation of his power in his successors on the Throne at Rome.

Eznik recounts that Marcion, the future heresiarch, after his Bishop had excommunicated him for a very grave sin, "went (from Persia) to Rome on a penitential quest to obtain pardon. Since he did not obtain it, he became enraged against the faith," convinced as he was that the supreme authority of pardon was to be found alone at Rome. As for Eznik of Kolb, he found nothing surprising in this conviction of Marcion.

It is to be noted that Moses of Koroun, in mentioning the three first Ecumenical Councils (of Nicea, Constantinople and Ephesus) cites, before all the other Bishops and Patriarchs, the names of the Roman Pontiff or of his delegates, as presidents of these same councils.

The Armenian Church has adopted in its canons the decisions made at the Holy Council of Sardica of 343, according to which the Holy See of Rome is considered as the last tribunal of appeal.

Even after the Council of Chalcedon, the Armenians remained officially within the Catholic unity, until Moses Yeghivartetsi (574-604). Eastern Armenia separated with this Patriarch. Nevertheless, there were often Patriarchs who professed the doctrine of Chalcedon in succeeding times. The faithful of the part of Armenia remaining under the Greek domination remained attached to Catholic unity through their ties with Byzantium.

At the Cilician epoc, in the times of the Pahlavouni Patriarchs and their successors, direct relations were established with the Holy See of Rome. In his "Elegy of Edessa" our genial Saint Chenorhali concentrated the Catholic Armenia belief on this matter in a few words: "And thou, Rome, Mother of cities, most illustrious and venerable, seat of the Great Peter, head of the apostles, unconquerable Church founded upon the rock of Cephas, invincible against the gates of Hell and seal of Him Who opens the heavens."

We know that the celebrated Fr. Alichan, thanks to his extraordinary diligence, has succeeded in collecting all the letters exchanged between the Holy See of Rome and the Armenian Church. They form a number of large volumes and are precious and glorious pages for our history. It would take too long to mention the writings and acts of the Synods of Romgla, of Sis and of Adana. It will suffice to cite the letter of Gregory VI Abirad to Pope Innocent III: "To you who are the head after Christ, sanctified by Him, and head of the Catholic Church of Rome, mother of all the Churches; who are wise and holy also, and as it befits the one who replaces the apostles, sovereign Pontiff . . . Gregory, servant of Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, Catholicos of the whole Armenian Church, son of your holy Church, which is the canonical foundation of all Christendom. Know that we, bishops, priests and clerics, pray Christ Jesus, Who is our head for all, to preserve you, as well as all those who surround You, from all evil; because, as long as You, the head, are intact, we also, the members, we are well by virtue of your blessing."

Even after the fall of the Dynasty of the Roupinians, a good number of the Catholics of Etchiadzine and of Sis, and of the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Constantinople maintained relations with the Holy See, and sent delegates and letters of submission there.

To qualify the content of these documents as rhetorical expressions or opportunists' expedients would be unworthy of a serious historian, while it would be offensive and injurious to those great Pontiffs who were of an entire and sincere Christian faith and of an apostolic sort of life. Hence, these testimonies remain the ineradicable and authentic expression of the Catholic spirit among the Armenian people.

This fluctuating state of relations with the Holy See came to an end in 1742 when the great Pope Benedict XIV renewed, in the person of Abraham I Ardzivian, the Armenian Catholic Hierarchy of Cilicia, to which was joined the primatial See of Constantinople with its dioceses. Thus, Divine Providence, utilizing authentic sons of Armenia, assured the uninterrupted preservation

of the entire holy Catholic faith among the Armenian people, through the indistructible bond of Saint Peter to the Holy See, for the glory of Christ, and the usefulness and advantage of the whole Armenian nation.

*(to be continued)*

* * * *

## THE CHURCH'S DIVINE UNITY AND THE SOVIET'S PLAN TO DESTROY IT

*From the discourse of Cardinal Tisserant, Pontifical Legate to the Eucharistic Congress of Nancy, July 7 to 10, 1949.*

His Eminence, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Prefect of the Pontifical Congregation for the Oriental Rite, presided as Papal Legate at the Eucharistic Congress which was held in his native city of Nancy during the month of July. In addressing the fervent throngs of the faithful, he described accurately and vividly the divine source of the Church's unity and accounted for the basic motives which have moved the Soviet Government to plan the destruction of the Roman Catholic Church. *Unitas* readers may likewise be interested in the counsel this eminent prelate gives during the course of his speech on the fitting attitude of Catholics toward those Christians who are not members of their Church.

In opening his discourse he establishes the prime importance of the Eucharist in the Christian religion and indicates the essential part maintained by Holy Orders in its structure:

"When Our Divine Master pronounced the words 'This is My Body . . . This is My Blood shed for many in remission of sins' before dying nailed to the Cross, he terminated the religion of Israel and inaugurated a new one: the religion of universal love. He gave the Holy Eucharist as a gift to humanity and willed that it be perpetually renewed in the Church through His ministers. The Eucharist was to be the culminating point of the Christian religion."

The Cardinal continues with an explanation of the Savior's will to communicate the infinite graces of His death to each member of the human race—all His brothers—within the framework of a society which would comprise all men. They would as a community collaborate with Him in His redemption. This group, likened by St. Paul to a body, was to be one, indivisible, necessarily visible, concrete, perceptible to the senses—not a purely spiritual entity in which various groups would be invisibly united, while maintaining differing beliefs. He describes the authentic Church: "The Church which Christ willed . . . can only be that formed from the assembly of the baptized who profess a common faith and obey legitimately established authorities. . . ." He indicates the charitable attitude to be taken to separated Christians: "We should doubtless maintain particular benevolence toward those who rally

closely about Christ while not belonging to the Catholic Church, if they are sincere in their beliefs, since Jesus reproved His disciples for objecting to a man who drove out demons in His Name without belonging to their group. 'There is no one who shall work a miracle in My Name, and forthwith be able to speak ill of Me. For he who is not against you is for you.' (Mk. 9,39,40) If then you come upon someone who has faith in Christ, but who is born in a Protestant land, or in some country of the Orient whose inhabitants have been torn away by leaders who had been led astray by pride, you should hold for them the utmost tender solicitude." These meetings are more frequent today because of the many refugees who have fled from the regions dominated by atheistic materialism. "Do all in your power to help them to live: come to their assistance, materially and spiritually, with all the compassion of your Christian charity."

After explaining that the Priesthood was established at the time of the institution of the Holy Eucharist, and that He had also established the nature of the principal acts of worship, he states that Priest and Bishops—and only Bishops can ordain Priests—receive their sacred Orders in view of the Eucharist. Only they can consecrate, decide upon admission to the Holy Table, reconcile sinners through Penance, receive into the Church apostates or those who have lived in heresy or schism. "Our Lord, then, willed that the distribution of the fruits of the Redemption be carried out within the framework of the Church: it is accomplished through the members of the Clergy and herein lies the reason why to the teachers of atheistic materialism the disorganization of the Catholic Church and the suppression of its clergy is the most important of their enterprises." They realize that with the suppression of Bishops and Priests in a region, the faithful's force of resistance would be weakened through deprivation of the Real Presence. Where the suppression remains incomplete, they seek to produce a schism within the clergy, and reduce liturgical celebrations and communions to rare occasions. Thus the cohesion of the Church's members will be grievously compromised.

Wherefore the Government of Moscow ordered the arrest of the five prelates in the eastern and southern provinces of Poland which were incorporated into the U.S.S.R. at the end of 1944. Priests were urged to separate from the Roman See. If they refused they were imprisoned, deported or obliged to go into hiding. The five Bishops, one now dead, while four continue to serve a long term of forced labor, were condemned by an unjust trial which took place behind closed doors at Kiev in the spring of 1946.

"The suppression of the Bishops prepares the disappearance of the Priests, for the reason that only the Bishops are able to ordain Priests. Wherefore the six Catholic Bishops of Oriental Rite in Rumania were arrested in the night between the 27th and the 28th of October, 1948. The government agents had for a month been persecuting the Priests, bringing insistent pressure to bear upon them to convince them that they should separate from the

Holy See. . . . The Bishops are in prison; they cannot either ordain Priests or administer their dioceses."

The Cardinal then traces the advance of the organized system of extermination. They began with the Oriental Rite Catholics, but soon attacked the Latin Rite Church. Archbishop Stepinac, and the Cardinal Primate of Hungary are Latins. The courageous Archbishop Beran of Prague is a Latin, "whom I had the occasion to meet at Rome a few months ago when he came to request a last blessing of the Holy Father before the crisis which he felt near should burst forth. One may certainly not accuse Msgr. Beran of not being a good patriot. He passed too much time in the worst Nazi camps. But he did enlighten the Czechoslovak clergy and faithful when a move was made to draw them into schism. This was his whole crime, as it was that of the two Latin Bishops of Rumania arrested . . . on June 20 and 26. They did not wish that the Catholic Church and her organizations should pass under the control of the State.

"In this they obeyed the order of the Divine Master, for Jesus forbade his followers to permit the perpetration of this usurpation when he taught them to distinguish between the two powers with the words which have never ceased to inspire the Church throughout its history: 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.' "

He finds it appropriate to proclaim a new martyrology of the Episcopacy and of the Priesthood in a Eucharistic celebration, because "the priests and bishops receive holy orders principally in view of the Eucharist; it is also because of the Eucharist that they are being persecuted today; likewise, *since the Eucharist is the secrament of Christian unity,* the persecutor hopes to obtain a speedy disintegration of the Church by depriving the dioceses of their Bishops and parishes of their Priests. Indeed the Priests are reduced to this alternative: apostatize if they wish to continue functioning in their churches, or abandon a parish to which afterward they could only slip in with great difficulty to perform clandestine services."

Even so the life of the Church itself is not threatened. "The Church has the habit of persecution; it does not frighten her. But I would like you to comprehend today the infinite anguish of our Father and beloved Pontiff. Day after day he learns details of the persecution which his sons endure while he cannot come to their assistance. . . . From the beginning of his pontificate he has received daily the heartbreaking news of Priests and Bishops impeded in their teaching, thrown into prison, closed up in camps, deported, condemned to long punishments or put to death. . . . Yet it is not only the sufferings of the members of the hierarchy which make the heart of the Pope bleed. He also suffers in thinking of the apostates who lose their souls, and who will have difficulty in finding someone to absolve them should they come to repentance, and of the Christians of little fervor who will find it less easy to gain their salvation during the whole period of persecution."

He terminates his discourse with an appeal for union in the Eucharist: "Then unite the offering of your heart with the offering which Jesus makes of Himself to the Father . . . so that those who are separated from the Catholic Church, dissidents or atheists . . . be attracted to her in such wise that with the aid of divine grace they may also come to participate in the unity and the charity which shine resplendently in our Church."

* * * *

## AN ANGLICAN'S OBJECTIONS TO THE DEFINITION OF THE ASSUMPTION*

Mr. Victor Bennet has published a short article of five pages on *The Assumption of the Virgin and Papal Infallibility* which it seems to us useful to consider. This article appeared first in *Theology* (September, 1948) and was reprinted at London (S.P.C.K., 1948).

We shall first summarize the reasoning of the author. It is now more than eighty years since the infallibility of the Pope became a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church. Until now no harm has come from it since the Pope has defined nothing. The definition of infallibility rather served to put an end to definitions. This policy, in fact, could encourage the hope of reunion of the Anglican Community with the Church of Rome. A new danger has arisen. It has been announced that Pope Pius XII is going to define the Assumption, perhaps during the Holy Year of 1950. But, the Assumption cannot be a dogma. A dogma must be found in Scripture, or in the teaching of the Apostles, and the Assumption is not found there—it was not until some centuries after that the apocryphal writings speak of it. If the Pontiff defines it, what will be thought of his infallibility? After all, it is in the exercise that one judges a power, just as "the proof of the pudding is very much in the eating." The definition of the Assumption will amuse the Protestant world, but this amusement will be at a high price. The price will be paid from honor of Christianity common to all Christians. Even though the undertaking may be arduous, all those who are able should bring to the Christian cause their service in avoiding such a misfortune.

Certainly, Victor Bennet's desire to protect the honor of the Christian name and not to remove all hope of the Anglicans' reunion with Rome is a sincere one and worthy of respect. Nevertheless, it is entirely occasioned by the Anglican position and cannot be shared by a Catholic. If the Pope was not really infallible, he could, indeed, make a mistake in defining the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin. But, if he is infallible, as the Catholic Church believes him to be, and if he defines this doctrine, this doctrine is by that very fact certain in the whole measure of its definition. The definition will then only mean to Catholics the joy of knowing that a truth which has been

*Reprinted from *Doctor Communis*, Rome, Sept.-Dec., 1948.

dear to their hearts for centuries was really revealed by God. On the contrary, if Mr. Bennet's difficulties were well founded, and if the Mother of God was not today living in her glorified body, the Pope would not define the Assumption. The Holy Ghost aids His Church and preserves it from error. That which Peter binds or loosens on the earth is bound or loosed in Heaven. Among Catholics, then, there is no worry, no trouble; there is only a great hope.

This does not mean that Catholics remain passive with regard to this definition. They have desired it, they have demanded it, they have also minutely and severely examined the possibility over a long period of time, and this examination on their part still continues. Rigidly scientific studies are published one after another in rapid succession.

The theologians, at least, ignore none of the objections which Mr. Bennet enumerates. They admit that revelation was closed after the death of the last Apostle. They recognize that no trace of tradition anterior to the fourth century and perhaps later exists on this point. They avow the lengendary character of the apocryphal writings. They know that while the fact of the Assumption may not have been denied by any Christian, it was nevertheless put in doubt for a time, or admitted as a simple pious opinion. In spite of this, they are today unanimous in affirming the fact of the Assumption of Mary, and the greater number of them uphold its definability as at least probable.

This is because they believe in the reality of the assistance which Jesus Christ promised His Church, and they find that today and for a long time the Christian people together with their Bishops believe firmly in the Mother of God's presence in Heaven, both in soul and body. In the Church such an accord cannot be formed on an error. The Catholic theologians also hold that while revelation, existing in oral as well as written form, was closed at the death of the Apostles, it is capable of being better explained and more clearly known during the course of time. Some notions were confided to us whose entire content is only penetrated slowly and gradually. On this question we may refer the Anglicans to the book of Newman. Such an idea of Mary Virgin Mother of God, associated with the Redeemer is given us in Holy Scripture that we cannot conceive of her as being subjected to sin nor to the corruption which results from sin. This suffices to say that the Assumption can be defined. If as a consequence it is defined, we have by virtue of the promised assistance of the Holy Ghost the guarantee that we do not err, and that we interpret revelation correctly. Since there is nothing in all this which is not reasonable, the non-Catholics should not find any cause for amusement in it.

Wherefore, the wall of separation between Roman Catholics and Anglicans will not be raised one inch higher. When a Christian of the Anglican confession comes to recognize the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome as his

forefathers did before Henry VIII, the necessity of believing in the Assumption will not be the thing which hinders his entrance into the Roman Church. But as long as this supremacy is not recognized, the separation will persist, whether the Assumption is defined or not. It would do little good to conform with the infallibility of the Pope if it were on the condition that the Pope never defined anything. It is to be hoped on the contrary that the definition of the Assumption, if it is to take place (I do not know any better than Mr. Bennet) will exalt the pontifical privilege, while it honors the Blessed Virgin and gladdens the hearts of the Catholics. The light which is given on the glories of the Mother of God reflect upon the whole body of doctrine, and the more that Catholic doctrine becomes luminous, the more will its attraction increase.

The Catholics, then, far from looking upon the definition of the Assumption as a misfortune, will continue to appeal for it with their desires and their prayers, in the hope that the hour of the Anglicans' return to Catholic unity will thereby be promoted.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

# News

## ECUMENISM[1]

### POSITION OF THE SEPARATED ORIENTAL CHURCH

Professor G. Florovsky,[2] member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, gives his opinions on the participations of the dissident Oriental Church in the ecumenical movement in the May issue of *The Messenger of the Russian Church in Western Europe*. This monthly publication is the organ of the Russian Church in Emigration (Paris) attached to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.

He explains that participation must be understood as "participation in the ecumenical conversation." This is not only "admissible" but based on the duty of "bearing witness untiringly of Orthodoxy." The Separated Oriental Church sees in itself "the custodian of the faith of the Apostles and of the full apostolic tradition and therefore as the one, true Church." He finds that as such it "occupies an exclusive position in the midst of the divisions of Christendom." It is then the duty of their theologians to contribute not their own theological opinions, but the teachings of the Church.

He considers the question of whether or not the ecumenical movement is the proper place for this witness. "It is impossible to ignore the problem posed by the fact of the Reformation . . . even if the solutions of Protestantism have to be rejected." The separated Orientals should follow this problem from within and lead it to "Catholic Solutions." For this one must, he finds, have travelled the same way one's self as a partner in the conversations, and especially now when "Protestant positions are being tested to their foundations, and half forgotten (spiritual) fields and depths are being discovered."

He comments upon the refusal of the 1948 Moscow Congress to permit participation in the ecumenical movement in its present form. Only 23 of the 85 seats reserved to the separated Oriental Church were occupied. But the organization of the World Council must be understood "in its present form," and the Moscow resolution is to be looked upon as final. It "excludes the possibility of the majority of Orthodox Churches participating in the ecumenical work for a long time."

He finds that the value of the Oriental Church's participation is not threatened since it is possible for a few individual Churches to represent the whole. He says that from the beginning "Orthodoxy has been represented in the World Council en bloc; the places were not specifically distributed among

---

1) Abbreviations of news sources:
EPS: *Ecumenical Press Service*, Geneva.
S.OE.P.I.: *Service oecumenique de Presse et d'Information*, Geneva.
NCWC: News service of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington.
Oss. Rom.: *Osservatore Romano*.
CIP: Press service of the *Centro Informazione e Pubblicazioni* for Italy, Rome.
SICO: *Servizio Informazioni Chiesa Orientale*.

2) Rev. Prof. G. Florovsky, Professor of Theology, Paris; since November, Professor of St. Vladimir Academy of Orthodox Theology, New York.

the different Churches." Representation was given to "the Orthodox Confession as a whole, not to its separate Churches." Instead of the territorial principle, the confessional principle was applied. "In Moscow this was regarded as an oversight. . . . In actual fact it signified the very opposite. . . . The unity of the Orthodox viewpoints seemed so obvious, that the territorial principle necessarily assumed secondary importance. . . . *Any of the Orthodox Churches could fully represent Orthodoxy as a whole.*[1] The territorial criterion must not be underestimated. But overemphasis on the territorial criterion, especially in Orthodoxy, is a proof of unhealthy particularism and the blunting of the ecumenical consciousness." He states further, "Local interests must give way, when the basis of the Christian faith and the future of Christendom are under discussion."

1) Editor's italics.

In this last statement Prof. Florovsky strikes a deep and sound note. On the other hand, does he not exceed legitimate hope in the autocephalic Churches' common fund of belief? They unite in professing to accept the seven first Councils and in this they are even at one with the Roman Catholic Church. Yet they frequently find themselves at odds among themselves in their mode of acceptance of them as is patent from the wide differences of interpretation to be found in their own theological writings, which they are unable to guarantee by an ultimate authority. In so much, they could go so far as to propound to the followers of the Reformation the necessity of returning to the seven first councils, but could hardly present the doctrine which they contain without being questioned by some one or another of the Churches which they intended to represent. Surely Prof. Florovsky must be understood here as envisioning an ideal still to be striven for rather than describing a realized accord which is capable of functioning as such.

* * * *

## *CONTINUED PARTICIPATION OF SEPARATED GREEK CHURCH ASSURED*

Dr. Hamilcar Alivisatos, Professor of the University of Athens and member of the World Council's Central Committee, reported at a June session of the Committee at Chichester that the separated Greek Church would continue its participation in the World Council.

He said that at a recent meeting of the Synod "it was unanimously decided that apart from a detailed discussion of the Amsterdam Resolutions, which will follow next autumn, the Church of Greece will confirm without any interruption cooperation with the World Council." He added, "We are preparing the festival of the 1900th anniversary of the foundation of the Christian Church in Europe through the Apostle Paul's preaching in Athens and Greece in an ecumenical way and this is evidence of the firm cooperation of the Greek Orthodox Church of Greece in the World Council." (EPS)

## *WHAT IS EXPECTED OF THE WORLD COUNCIL*

At a session of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in July, Bishop G. K. A. Bell delivered a speech entitled "What the Churches Expect from the World Council." In it he emphasized that the World Council was beginning at a time when nationalism was on the increase, and when the world was acutely divided in a variety of ways, economically, politically and spiritually. Its existence was therefore a demonstration of a supra-national unity. He said:

"The Churches expect the World Council . . . and especially the Central Committee, to do everything in its power to emphasize this supra-national unity; and where another kind of supra-national unity is presented, based on class or race, to proclaim the unity of Christians in Christ, and its implications, with all the greater conviction. . . . The World Council must not in any way present itself as a single unified church structure independent of the Churches, but it . . . should be the body to which Christians (outside the Church of Rome) would naturally resort for strength and support. The members of the World Council should stand together. The Churches expect the World Council to attempt to state what the Christian faith has to offer to a solid basis for international and supernational law. It does seem to me that the Central Committee has a duty to discharge to the Churches in giving further guidance on the attitude which Christians ought to adopt towards Communism. . . ."

Many Churches appear to expect "the applications by the Central Committee of the Assembly's general statement about 'utterly opposing totalitarianism wherever found' and about pressing for 'freedom of speech and expression of association and assembly . . . freedom from arbitrary arrest' to the present situation in large parts of Eastern Europe."

* * * *

## *FAITH AND ORDER CONFERENCE*

Some 70 participants, including 46 delegates, attended the Conference of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches which met at Chichester from July 16 to 20. The following countries were represented: Britain, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Germany, Holland, Japan, Switzerland, Sweden, Turkey, and the United States. The following professions were represented: Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Greek Orthodox, Lutheran, Moravian, Old Catholic, Presbyterian and Reformed Churches as well as a representative of the Oecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.

The Conference was presided by Bishop Y. Brilioth of Växjö, Sweden. The discussion treated of the fundamental issue of prayer and intercommunion underlying ecumenicity, problems of corporate worship at ecumenical gath-

erings as regards existing forms and traditions, the creation of a new "ecumenical" mode which the opening and closing services at the Amsterdam Assembly were intended to indicate.

* * * *

## *WORLD MEETING OF FAITH AND ORDER IN 1952*

In its concluding session the Faith and Order Commission decided that the world meeting of Faith and Order should be held in the summer of 1952 at Lund, Sweden, and that it should bring together 250 participants.

* * * *

## *WORLD COUNCIL'S RELATIONS WITH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH*

Dr. Visser 'tHooft, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, made a report to the Faith and Order Conference on the first year of the Council's official existence. In speaking of relations with the Catholic Church, he said: "The outstanding factor in our relations with the Roman Catholic Church has been the quite remarkable interest in the Assembly which has been shown by Roman Catholics in all walks of life. . . . The Roman Catholic Press has printed very full, and, in a number of cases, remarkably thorough and fair, articles about the Assembly. This interest in Amsterdam is part of a more general movement in the Roman Catholic Church which takes a deep interest in all ecumenical developments. . . .

"The attitude of the World Council can only be to encourage every constructive attempt to arrive at genuine ecumenical relationships. In the present situation this means concretely that we must concentrate on unofficial contacts with individual Roman Catholics. In spite of rumors to the contrary, it remains a fact that the highest leadership of the Roman Catholic Church has forbidden the attendance of the unofficial Roman Catholic observers who had been invited to come to Amsterdam and that no alternative proposal was made by it. The only road open to us is, therefore, to foster personal relationships. We do not know where that road will lead. It may be that it is a blind alley. It may also be that it leads to unsuspected and hopeful oecumenical developments."

* * * *

## *OPPOSITION AND SINCERITY*

A sincere and piercing observation was made by Rev. Oliver Tomkins, Associate General Secretary of the World Council with the portfolio for Faith and Order. He concluded a discussion of corporate worship and intercommunion with a remark that touches the bed-rock of sincerity. He said, ". . . if we are challenged in our most cherished assurances, it may be the Lord Who is challenging us."

Discussion was intensified by a letter which he then read, written by the Congregationalist C. H. Dodd, New Testament scholar of Cambridge. It contained this passage: "I have an uneasy suspicion that when long and patient discussion is bringing us within sight of a measure of agreement, there are some of us who take fright at the danger that our 'distinctive witness' may prove less distinctive than we thought. . . . We should, I think, do well to ask ourselves whether, in reference to any debatable point, 'Is my strong sense of opposition really grounded in some profound truth, to deny which would argue the lie in the soul, or is it really due to intense (and it may be legitimate) pride in the tradition to which I belong' . . ."

* * * *

## *CHURCH OF SCOTLAND*

At the meeting of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in Edinburgh on June 1, the Assembly authorized its Inter-Church Relations Committee to accept the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury for informal discussions with a view to fuller consideration of Inter-Communion between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England.

* * * *

## *LUTHERANISM AND CHRISTIAN UNITY*

Dr. Anders Nygren, Chairman of the Lutheran World Federation and Bishop of Lund, Sweden, speaking at the "1949 Church Week" at Hamburg is reported by the *Evangelischer Pressedienst* of Bethel on May 4, to have said that Lutheranism's will to unity had nothing to do with confessionalistic strivings for power, but was based on consciousness on the part of Lutheran Churches throughout the world of their common responsibility and their common message. Fears lest this will to unity might in some way harm the ecumenical movement, which at the Amsterdam Assembly had taken a real step forward, were wholly unfounded. Lutheranism and the ecumenical movement were most closely bound up together. The Lutheran confession was a necessity for the deepening of ecumenical work to unite Christendom, and the prospect of Christian unity was a necessity if the Gospel was to stand forth in its true importance.

* * * *

## *ECUMENICAL APPROACH OF CLUNY GROUP*

The Protestant Religious of the Taizé-lès-Cluny community (cf. *Unitas*, April-June, p. 63), wishing to incarnate the spirit of the Reform in the new life it is taking up, is of the opinion that no ecumenism is possible outside of a real integration in a precise ecclesiastical body. Unity, they feel, should be sought for in the deepening of the Protestant faith and piety, down to its

sources. They hope by sounding the depths of Protestantism to rediscover the piety of the primitive Church. By a return to the living sources of the primitive community as they are described in the Acts of the Apostles (Chaps. 2 and 6) the Church should renew itself and adapt itself to the world of today. (EPS)

* * * *

## *OLD CATHOLICS AND MOSCOW*

In his report to the 75th national Synod of the "Christian-Catholic Church" of Switzerland in May, Msgr. A. Kuery, Bishop of the national diocese, announced that the independent Old-Catholic Church of the Philippines had entered into close relations with the Patriarchate of Moscow, following upon many ties which already existed between them.

---

# ROME

## *THE HOLY OFFICE PUBLISHES A RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS ON COMMUNISM*

*The Acta Apostolicae Sedis* at the express command of Pope Pius XII has published in its issue of July 13 a response of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office to a series of four inquiries concerning Communism. The four questions and the answers to them have already been widely publicized by the Catholic Press. The reply constitutes a formal condemnation of Communism. The Church has now stated clearly the penalty of collaborating in or of furthering Communistic activities. It is impossible to do so willingly and remain in the required disposition for the reception of the Sacraments. One casts himself totally beyond the pale of the Church when he assents to and defends the philosophy of Marxist materialism.

In recent years it has frequently been observed that the world is becoming cleanly divided into two camps on the basic religious issue: belief in God or no God; man's rightful subjection to His Creator, or a hypothetical independence in a world that is fated to suffer what we choose to do with it. A nebulous gray is separating into distinct black and white. The Holy Office response cuts a sharper line between the ranks of light and darkness. It places Catholics under an obligation, and offers the occasion to non-Catholics, of affirming their stand either for or against Christ.

It is evident that this statement of the Church has political repercussions, yet it would be absurd for a civil authority to pass judgment on this essential spiritual problem of man's relation to His Creator. The Holy Office's decisions

on the attitude to be taken by Catholics in regard to Communism has political effects only insofar as temporal authorities overstep their proper limits and use their powers to swerve men from obedience to that divine Authority who is seated above and beyond their sphere.

Faced with a perilous psychological dilemma, the Communist Togliatti in Italy attempted to wash his hands of the matter by saying that a member of any political party is responsible for his own salvation. In the lands under Soviet domination the various governments have resorted to the most extreme measures of legislation, coercion and violence to impede the effect of this menace to their perverted purposes. In Czechoslovakia where the Communist state is pounding with full might upon the stone of contradiction, Archbishop Beran has told his clergy: "I am sure that you will not sell your honour for thirty pieces of silver." In Moscow, despite the professedly materialistic nature of the Communist ideal, and despite the Soviet's rejection of the individual soul's rights, and its consistently open anti-Christian social and educational program, the Patriarch Alexis has found it possible to declare that the excommunication of Communist supporters "would fundamentally contradict the main tenets of the Orthodox Christian faith" and states that there can be no conflict between loyalty to the Soviet State and loyalty to the dissident Russian Church. It is easier now to recognize the one true fold for its shepherds are found ready to lay down their lives for their sheep.

## *CONDITIONS FOR HOLY YEAR INDULGENCES*

According to the Papal Bull which officially proclaims "a great and universal jubilee to be held in this beloved city from Christmas, 1949, to Christmas, 1950," the following conditions should be met by pilgrims in order to gain jubilee indulgences:

"During this year of expiation, to all the faithful who duly confess their sins in the Sacrament of Penance, who receive Holy Communion and visit once on that day, or on different days, in the order of their choice, the basilicas of St. John Lateran, St. Peter's in the Vatican, St. Paul's on the Ostian Way, and St. Mary Major on the Esquiline, and recite in each basilica three times the 'Our Father,' 'Hail Mary' and 'Glory be to the Father,' and as well one 'Our Father,' Hail Mary' and 'Glory be to the Father' for Our intentions, and will add in each basilica a 'Credo,' We grant and bestow in the Lord the full indulgence and pardon of all punishment due for sins.

"In favor of those who, when in Rome or on their way to Rome through illness or death or some other just cause, are prevented from completing or even beginning these visits, We reduce aforesaid conditions so that, provided they go to Confession and receive Communion, they may gain the jubilee indulgence just as those who visit the four above-mentioned basilicas.

"We also declare that the faithful may gain the jubilee indulgences either for themselves or for the faithful departed as often as they fulfill the prescribed conditions."

---

## INVITATION

**Visitors at Rome during the Holy Year who are not members of the Roman Catholic Church will receive a special welcome at the UNITAS office. UNITAS will be prepared to give information to those desiring a clearer knowledge of that Church, and will strive as well to be of service to those who wish to visit the historical monuments of Christianity in the Eternal City.**

**UNITAS**
**Piazza Farnese 96**
**Rome.**

---

## GERMANY

### *CATHOLIC LIFE IN BERLIN*

Fervent Catholic life is found at Berlin in spite of the post-war vicissitudes. An average of 100,000 Catholics attend Sunday Mass there. In the Red Sector, the Catholics, under surveillance, are frequently forced to work on Sundays. More than 5,000 infants have been baptized in the last year and 2,000 marriages celebrated. A total of 5 million Communions reflect the fervor of the faithful.

Catholic gatherings are attended in large numbers. Charitable institutions, such as hospitals and homes for the aged, are more active than ever. Even institutions for children are filled in spite of the Communistic attempts to draw them to their own charity institutions.

Catholic schools continue. The Catholic spirit manifested itself when 4,000 young Catholics made a demonstration of protest in the Soviet sector against the condemnation of Cardinal Mindszenty. A street in the western sector was named *Pacellistrasse* on the occasion of the Holy Father's jubilee. The lifting of the blockade eased the strained conditions of the Catholics, who had been obliged to import newsprint, Mass wine and other essentials by air. Catholic activities in the Eastern Zone, while slightly eased, proceed under great difficulties. The *Petrusblat* which had been banned by Soviet

authorities, may now be obtained, but only by Pastors who are able to call for it in person. Because of discrepancy in money values, Mass wine and printed matter are almost beyond reach. The deliberate Soviet restrictions on travel add to the hardships. Because of the limited seminary facilities in the Soviet zone, most theological students study at Fulda. To go there or return to their homes is an arduous undertaking. Strict Soviet control of the schools continues. Religious instruction is permitted in the schools insofar as they are found not to interfere with classes. (NCWC)

* * * *

## FRANCE

### *FIFTH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF PROPAGANDA FOR UNITY*

A congress of 200 delegates of the "Propagande pour l'Unité," coming from Paris and all parts of France, was held at Senlis in July. The delegates worked especially on the problem of practical methods of apostolate. The speakers were Rev. Fr. Fillère, Rev. Richard, Rev. Déjond, Rev. Laugier, Rev. Fr. Emeury, Messrs. Busse, Cordier, Martin and Baresta. Among the subjects dealing with the current situation were *The Theological Study of the Sacraments, The Modern Substitutes for the Sacraments,* and *Witness and Apostolate.* The members of the Congress sang their Sunday Mass at the Cathedral.

This Congress, marked by an extremely live and enthusiastic atmosphere, made an urgent call to separated Christians, and sent the Pope a message of devotion and filial submission.

* * * *

## ENGLAND

### *ANGLICAN RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES IN ENGLAND*

(From a study by Rev. Fr. A. Urrutia, F.C.M., *Commentarium pro Religiosis et Missionariis,* Jan.-June, 1948.)

A certain obscurity remains on the order of appearance of religious communities, especially on the matter of the first truly religious community. Sometimes the convent of St. Thomas in Oxford is cited, and sometimes the Society of the Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity at Oxford, and sometimes the Society of the Most Holy Trinity at Devonport. For clarity's sake we shall distinguish between communities as such and those approved or as communities with vows.[1] The first "community" but without vows or full approbation of the Anglican Episcopate, beginning in 1845, was that of Park

1) The terms *Religion, Order* and *Congregation* when applied to the Protestant organization should not be understood in the strict canonical sense which is intended when treating of communities canonically established within the Catholic Church.

Village. The first with religious habit and full local approbation was the convent of St. Thomas, in 1847. The first with habit and perpetual religious vows of poverty, chastity and obedience was the Society of the Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity in 1849. Although the Society of the Most Holy Trinity of Devonport had begun to exist in the same year, 1849, no vows were made and profession was not made before 1852. In this sense, it was preceded by the Community of the Blessed Virgin Mary (of Wantage) which began in 1848 and made vows in 1849.

The Catholic writer Peter F. Anson affirms that at the present time there are in the Anglican Church almost 60 Congregations of Sisters with 200 houses and 1,400 Sisters, which, according to him, amounts to more than double the number of Sisters who existed at the time of the suppression of monasteries in England. According to him there were no more than 745 nuns in England. This is difficult to admit. The *Catholic Encyclopedia,* at the word "Monasteries" affirms that at that period there were 376 monasteries in England with 1,800 male religious and 1,560 female religious. Whatever the case, it is certain that at present there are about 50 Congregations of women and 9 of men in England, without counting Scotland, Ireland and the countries beyond the sea. The number seems small if one compares it with the Catholic Congregations in England. In spite of the small number of Catholics in the British Isles there are more than 183 Congregations of women and 62 Congregations of men. The religious Priests alone number more than 2,134.

### *BROMPTON ORATORY CELEBRATES CENTENARY*

On the feast of the Ascension the Congregation of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri solemnly celebrated the Centenary of its foundation in England. The Holy Father addressed a Letter to the London Oratory in which He calls upon them for fresh efforts in bringing non-Catholics back to unity in England. The pertinent passage reads:

"May truth make you free, but charity enslave you, and both bring you happiness. In rebuilding the edifice of religious unity from which evil times have separated great numbers of Englishmen, while keeping the faith intact, let this spirit and this purpose move you to show yourselves as different from rather than opposed to those erring brothers who will one day return to be one with you. Unite with them now as closely as possible in charity, prepared to give them at a future time the truth in its fullness."

His Holiness recalled the fame and outstanding accomplishments of the Oratory and recalled the brilliant names of their founders, St. Philip, Cardinal Newman who made the English foundation at Edgbaston, near Birmingham, and Father Faber whose preaching and publications made the London Oratory widely known.

### *NEIGHBORHOOD APOSTOLATE FOR UNITY*

Door-to-door visits to non-Catholics with the intention of removing

prejudice and explaining the true character of the Catholic Faith are now being made throughout England by members of the Legion of Mary. This charitable work was reported at the annual national conference of the Legion. The Legion numbers 821 praesidia in England and Wales. There are 7,000 active members and 39,000 auxiliary members.

## *30,000 PRAY FOR RUSSIA*

Thirty thousand people, taking part in a Rosary rally in honor of the Immaculate Heart of Mary at Manchester, prayed before an open air altar to invoke Our Lady's intercession for the conversion of Russia. The prayers were offered in the intention of carrying out Our Lady's desires as expressed in her miraculous appearance at Fatima.

## *A CHAPEL FOR ANGLICAN FELLOWSHIP WITH SEPARATED ORIENTALS*

A chapel for the use of members of the *Fellowship of St. Alban and Sergius* has recently been opened at St. Basil's House, Ladbroke Grove, London. The *Fellowship,* a numberous and popular society with many young members, is under the presidency of the Anglican Bishop of Derby. Father Anthony Bloom is the Oriental rite chaplain. It works to promote understanding and cooperation among Eastern and Western Christians.

The chapel was dedicated by Archbishop Germanos, Metropolitan of Thyateira, one of the six Presidents of the World Council of Churches. It is the property of the Dissident Orientals, but is intended as a common place of worship for Anglicans as well. The service, although based on the Oriental ceremony for the consecration of a church, was almost entirely carried out in English. The Archbishop Germanos in his address stated that he had often advised faithful of his own confession to go regularly to Anglican churches, to listen to sermons and to pray in company with Anglicans (although not taking part in their communion) whenever they are living far away from their own churches. He said that in thus acting he is conforming to the "Christian principles for which, for the last thirty years have brought it about that the Oecumenical Patriarchate should promote friendship, mutual understanding and cooperation between the Orthodox and members of other Churches in matters related to the common interest of the whole of Christendom." Although the dissident Oriental Church acknowledges as the Catholic Church does, the prime obligation of maintaining the doctrine of Christ pure, Archbishop Germanos apparently does not recognize the same obligation of protecting it. He does not seem to have considered all the inherent factors of *participatio in sacris,* such as the impression of assent to the Anglican claim of legitimacy which is given when his faithful participate in their official ceremonies, or the fact that since the ordinary faithful are hardly equipped to

judge upon the fundamental theological doctrine imparted in oratorical form from the pulpit, the correctness of their beliefs are threatened when they assist at such expositions of another doctrine. The practice would at least open the door wide to indifferentism.

### *ST. NICHOLAS HOUSE AT OXFORD*

The St. Nicholas House of the separated Orientals in Oxford was blessed on May 21st by Archimandrite Nicholas Gibbes.

### *CENTENARY OF ST. JOHN OF DAMASCUS*

The St. John Damascene Society (non-Catholic) has formed a Committee at London to commemorate the 12th centenary of the death of St. John of Damascus. A program has been projected for the month of December which will include services, lectures, and publications.

* * * *

## IRELAND

### *MISSION FOR NON-CATHOLICS*

For the second year in succession the Redemptorist Fathers have conducted a mission for non-Catholics at Belfast during the Sundays of Lent. As many as 800 non-Catholics were present. Questions and discussions followed the lectures.

* * * *

## HOLLAND

### *ACTIVITIES OF THE APOSTOLATE OF UNION*

In response to an invitation from the sacred Oriental Congregation, the Central Direction of the Apostolate of Union (Apostolaat der Hereniging) in Holland will direct its activities toward the work of the Pontifical Palestine Commission recently established with Msgr. Thomas J. McMahon as President. The Apostolate of Union, with approbation of the Dutch Episcopate, has established a *Pro Palestina Commission* and has named the Very Rev. A. Smit as President. This Commission will seek to interest the Catholic members of Parliament in the Holy Land situation of safeguarding Catholic rights there and of finding a just solution of the intricate Palestine problem.

This Apostolate of Union, among other activities, in favor of Oriental Christians, looks to the spiritual welfare of the Ruthenian and Ukrainian refugees who are dispersed about their country, principally in Amsterdam, Rotterdam and The Hague.

These Religious are aided in their labors by the laity, both men and women, who visit the homes of the refugees, assist them in their needs, and

developing their own initiative. For instance, they recently opened courses of tailoring for Russian refugee girls.

The Apostolate of Union has recently acquired a house at The Hague. The ground floor was transformed into an oriental chapel. The Liturgy was solemnly celebrated there for the first time on the Feast of Pentecost. (Oss. Rom.)

* * * *

## UNITED STATES

### *NEW CATHOLIC DIRECTORY INDICATES GROWTH OF CHURCH*

The statistics of the 1949 Official Catholic Directory show that there are now 26,718,343 Catholics in the United States, Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands, being an increase of 642,646 over last year.

Seventeen dioceses report no changes in Catholic Population, fifteen show slight decreases, and substantial gains are won in 93 Sees. Archdioceses with more than 1,000,000 Catholics are: Chicago, 1,657,669; Boston, 1,283,-232; New York, 1,256,269, and Philadelphia, 1,031,866. Brooklyn is the largest diocese with 1,203,915, and Pittsburgh is second largest with a population of 787,479.

There are 181 members of the Hierarchy: 4 Cardinals, 20 Archbishops, and 157 Bishops. The new diocese of Joliet, Ill., has been erected with Most Rev. Martin D. McNamara as first Bishop. Nine new Bishops have been appointed to serve in the continental United States. There are 23 Archdioceses and 102 Dioceses. The clergy has been increased by 587 over last year, bringing the total number to 42,334. Six hundred and twenty-one Priests have died. The list of professed religious show 7,302 Brothers and 141,606 Sisters, or an increase of 490 Religious during the year. Student religious in seminaries have increased by 2,514, making a total of 26,215.

Full-time teaching staffs of educational institutions under Catholic auspices have reached a record total of 104,962. Seven thousand three hundred and seventy-six Priests are shown teaching as well as 3,540 Brothers, 432 scholastics, 80,484 Sisters. One thousand two hundred and eighty-four Religious and 1,734 more lay teachers are recorded than were teaching last year in Catholic schools.

The new Directory reports 14,277 parishes with resident pastors. There are 15,112 parishes, 5,802 chapels, 4,913 missions and 1,643 stations where Mass is offered regularly.

The Directory lists 11,332 separate educational institutions, an increase of 93 despite post-war conditions. These include 64 diocesan seminaries, 228 universities and colleges for men and women, 1,596 diocesan and parish high schools, 789 private high schools, 7,777 elementary parish schools, and 541

private elementary schools. There are 4,401,524 students in the various grades under Catholic instruction.

There are 713 Catholic general hospitals, an increase of 13 new institutions. Bed capacity has been increased by 740 to permit facilities of 95,283. There are 110 special hospitals with accommodations for 7,721 patients. In the total of 4,315,806 patients treated during the year, many were non-Catholics.

The number of converts exceeded 100,000. Adult baptisms numbered 117,130, and infant baptisms 1,054,339.

### *200 CONVERTS CONFIRMED IN NEW YORK*

On June 5 a group of 200 adult converts were confirmed by Bishop Joseph E. Flannelly, Auxiliary of New York. Almost all of the converts had received instruction in the Catholic Faith either at the Paulist Information Center or at St. Peter's Church. Instruction courses are held at both places under the direction of Rev. Vincent F. Holden, of the Paulist Fathers.

Father Holden is of the opinion that the Paulists' *Information Center* permits a "kindly cloak of anonymity" and an atmosphere permitting the prospective convert to "think things through" without the hazards of taking instruction in a neighborhood parish, where he could arouse the antagonism of non-Catholic friends and relatives, and where he could as well be undisturbed by the overzealous interest of Catholic friends and neighbors. (NCWC)

* * * *

## SPAIN

### *MISINFORMATION BEHIND REPORTS OF PERSECUTION*

Charges which continue to be made that in Spain there prevails a campaign of persecution and repression of the Protestant religion in a general effort to destroy Protestants' rights and freedom have been denied as absolutely false by Dr. Manuel Maestro, press attaché to the Spanish Embassy in Washington.

The error lies in setting down isolated instances of young political groups breaking up Protestant services as a systematic campaign to destroy Protestantism. These incidents do not result from teachings of Catholic authorities but from the misguided political zeal of youth, usually belonging to a traditionalist group known as the *Requetes,* who are dissatisfied with what they regard as the government's too indulgent treatment of non-Catholic groups. The proximate cause for these acts of violence is often the aggressively anti-Catholic propaganda of the Protestants themselves, who offend Catholics by ridiculing such Catholic practices as the devotion to the saints and to the Blessed Virgin. The Church authorities have deplored these attacks and the

government has on occasions posted police guards to protect Protestant chapels that were menaced.

Dr. Maestro says that it is absolutely untrue that one may not hold a government position, teach or be an officer in the army in Spain if he is a Protestant.

The fact is that the proportion of native Protestants in Spain is one in about 2,000. It is manifestly impossible for Protestants to hold public office on a large scale.

In answer to the charge that the government refuses to permit the opening of more Protestant chapels, Dr. Maestro stated that it is because there is no necessity for putting scarce building materials into more chapels. Protestants now have 160 chapels to accommodate approximately 20,000 followers. The proportion exceeds the 568 churches for the 1, 692,500 Catholics in the Madrid diocese.

It is not true that gatherings for worship in private homes are prohibited. Article 15 of the Spanish Bill of Rights supports the inviolability of the Spanish home. Anyone may gather friends in his home for prayer. It is not forbidden for Protestants to publish the Bible and other religious literature. A Protestant publishing house operates in Madrid for this purpose: the Editorial Espanola No. 2, Calle de Zurbaran, Madrid, under the direction of Isidro Aguilar Caballer.

He affirms the report that Protestant children are subject to compulsory Catholic instruction in the state schools, but he found in the high school where he formerly taught in Madrid that it was the practice to excuse the very rare Protestant pupils from examinations in Catholic doctrine. He explains that the practice is most reasonable since it should be of interest for them to have some knowledge of what the other 99.9 per cent of their compatriots believed. He adds that the same schools teach a course on mythology, but with no obligation upon the pupils to believe the myth. (NCWC)

* * *

Since the time of Philip II and the Reformation, the Pyrenees have formed a moral as well as a physical wall between Spain and the rest of Europe. Political and religious bias have combined to falsify a clear understanding of the Spanish mentality and culture which tended to develop apart from the common course. Since the Spanish Revolution international political interests have studiously increased the traditional antipathies, and the Protestants could hardly have remained unaffected. It is easily understood if Protestants generally have been misled—and some Catholics with them—informing their judgments upon the religious situation under a government designed to bridge a crisis and in a preponderantly Catholic nation. Perhaps it must remain difficult for non-Catholics to perceive that the Church, when carrying out its entrusted duty of protecting purity of faith among its mem-

bers, does not encroach upon the religious rights of the non-Catholics who live in their midst. However, all Christians are placed under an obligation of making a more rigorous examination of facts, and of reviewing principles more scrupulously since otherwise they could without willing it lend their moral force to the militant atheistic powers who are bent upon destroying not only the Catholic Church, but all Christianity.

Whatever one's opinion of the present Government, and whatever the offenses of its subjects, it should not be lightly passed over that the present regime is unequivocal in declaring the absolute supremacy of God, the only surety of human rights. Not many leaders of nations still speak as their Generalissimo recently did at a session of Congress: "Against the spirit of despair which permeates the philosophic pessimism of our time, Spain looks hopefully to the heavens, seeking a new clear horizon of intelligence and faith. Spain proclaims its certain and firm belief that humanity will find again its destiny and salvation only in the realms of the spirit, in which, amidst the difficulties of life, there flourishes Christian thought, and mankind refreshes the aridity of its heart under the protective and comforting shadow of the true God."

* * * *

## AUSTRIA

### *A LITURGICAL WEEK FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY*

A liturgical week took place at Vienna in the parish of St. Lawrence during the month of June. It was organized with the intention of prayer and interest in Christian Unity. The program recalled the manner of celebrating the Octave of the Epiphany at Rome at the Church of S. Andrea della Valle. Each day a Solemn Mass was celebrated in a different rite.

* * * *

## NORWAY

### *DEATH OF SIGRID UNDSET*

Mrs. Sigrid Undset, the internationally celebrated Norwegian novelist and esteemed patriot, died at her home near Lillehammer, Norway, at the age of 67 in early June.

She had received the Nobel Prize for literature in 1928. She had entered the Catholic Church in 1924, to be followed by her mother in 1929. Sigrid Undset was outstanding as a leader in a movement among the Norwegian intelligentsia toward the Catholic Church.

## CZECHOSLOVAKIA

### *THE CHURCH STANDS FIRM UNDER PERSECUTION*

In Czechoslovakia the Church remains remarkably firm in spite of the full persecution which the usurping state has brought against it.

The State Commission of Churches has proposed new legislation which will give the government the right to control nominations, finances, the requirements for administration of Churches of all confessions, to be submitted to Parliament at its proximate reopening. The Ministry of Education has occupied the Catholic consistorial offices in Prague and most dioceses of the country and uses the notepaper and seals of the Bishops. A counterfeit Catholic Action has been set up in an attempt to create a national Catholic Church subservient to the Government. The Ministry of Education has decreed that a compulsory course in social science is to be opened in each seminary by a professor appointed by the Ministry. In response to the Holy Office Decree of excommunication, the clergy was subjected to trickery and intimidation and the cities and towns were visited by armed squadrons to force adhesion to the bogus Catholic Action, while concentration camps were swelled with those who refused to subscribe.

Nevertheless, Archbishop Beran, held a virtual prisoner, remains absolutely firm as does the Czechoslovak Hierarchy in its entirety. Only 3 out of 615 priests in the archdiocese of Prague, 2 out of 700 in the diocese of Hradec Kralove, none from the 450 of the diocese of Budejovice have incurred excommunication. Thirty-three priests in the archdiocese of Prague had been coerced into signing the manifesto of the counterfeit Catholic Action, but 25 subsequently withdrew their signatures. Apparently the Government sponsored "Catholic Action" has failed as a movement since its official publication, *Katolicke Noviny,* has fallen from a circulation of 800,000 for the first number to 100,000 for the fourth and fifth issues.

On August 14th the Administrator Apostolic of Trnava and the Vicar-Capitular of Roznava, Msgr. Ambros Lazik and Msgr. Robert Pobozny, according to the appointment of Pius XII were consecrated as titular Bishops at Trnava. Excepting for the Archbishop of Prague and the aged Bishop of Kralove, both virtual prisoners, all the Hierarchy was present for the ceremony. According to prevailing law, Government approval is required for diocesan Bishops only. Both of these Bishops are from working-class families, but both had signed the Pastoral Letter of June 26th which the Government sees as a subversive document. Since their tribulations will certainly not delay they merit our fervent prayers.

The Government attempted to impede all access to Trnava for this ceremony, but although train service was halted for twelve hours before the consecration and although roads were blocked by police at every approach who

took the names of those entering the city, some 12,000 faithful attended, while the papal flag was raised on most churches. A crowd outside the Cathedral assisted at an open-air Mass singing hymns against the popular music projected by the Communists through loud speakers. They applauded enthusiastically the procession of the Clergy as they left the Church, and tore up or trampled in the mud the leaflets distributed by the Communists.

On July 31, according to the British United Press, a group of Priests of the Hradec Kralove diocese, who had been summoned under pain of fine or imprisonment to attend a meeting of the Regional Action Committee, forced their way in to their Bishop in confinement and solemnly professed their loyal obedience to him before proceeding to the meeting.

* * * *

## POLAND

### *AFTER THE HOLY OFFICE DECREE*

The Polish Council of State has issued a decree under the date of August 7 which prepares a legal apparatus to impede the effects of the Holy Office Decree on Communism. Under the appearance of guaranteeing freedom of conscience it makes illegal any attempt of the Church to enforce excommunication of Communists. Paragraph 3 states: "Anyone who forces another person, by whatever means to take part in religious ceremonies or worship, *or who illegally prevents another person from taking part in such ceremonies or worship,* is liable to imprisonment for up to five years." Paragraph 4 states: "Anyone who misuses freedom of belief by *refusing to let another person to take part in religious ceremonies because of his political, social or scientific activities or opinions,* is liable to imprisonment for up to five years."

Further legislation covers manifestations aroused by the alleged miracles of Our Lady at Lubin. Paragraph 9 states: "Anyone who misuses freedom of conscience for his own benefit, financial or otherwise, or who misuses people's credulity by spreading false information, or who deceives other people by spreading false information, or by cheating or fraud, is liable to imprisonment."

The Government did not delay to put its new apparatus into action. The Decree had hardly been published when 62 Priests were charged with violating the law for "the protection of conscience and religion."

* * * *

## HUNGARY

### *A NEW CHURCH AT BUDAPEST*

In spite of the adverse conditions, the Franciscans of Budapest have recently consecrated a new church built through the generosity of the faithful on the outskirts of Buda. It has the capacity for seating 700 persons.

## *STATISTICS OF THE CHURCH IN HUNGARY*

There are altogether 5,521 Priests serving 7,000,000 Catholics in Hungary, according to a recent survey. Since 1,400 of these Priests belong to religious orders, not all are occupied in direct ministry. There are 17 dioceses, three of which are archdioceses and 2 dioceses of Greek rite. There are 2,152 parishes and more than 2,500 missions. The seminarians number 813.

After the past epoch of persecution it is found that the number of Communions in the industrial centers has diminished from 1 to 2 per cent since 1948. The provincial cities and rural districts show no change. First Communions of children average between 36 and 42 per cent in the cities, and between 50 to 70 per cent in other regions.

## *MONTH OF ATONEMENT*

The Latin and Greek-Rite Catholic Hierarchy of Hungary declared June, the month of the Sacred Heart, as a month of penance and atonement. Special octaves of reparation to the Sacred Heart were held in all Catholic churches and chapels.

* * * *

# RUMANIA

## *RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES DISBANDED*

The Rumanian Government has decreed under date of August 2, a decree which makes unlawful all charitable, teaching or other active work carried on by religious Orders or Congregations. Since hospitals, schools and other of their institutions had been nationalized a year ago, these works are now declared public monopolies and all Orders and Congregations, apart from the contemplatives, are looked upon as superfluous. The religious were given twenty days to decide whether they wished to continue living as religious. The State will keep five houses open for those who wish to live there, probably as indiscriminate large groups. Those who do not wish to live there must report for work to the Ministry of Labour.

After the publishing of this decree many religious houses were invaded and pillaged by the popular militia, and the religious maltreated and put in confinement until final disposition should be made of them.

## *PATRIARCH JUSTINIAN HEADS DELEGATION OF THANKS TO GOVERNMENT*

On June 23 a delegation of nine representatives of the cults tolerated by the Popular Rumanian Republic with Patriarch Justinian as spokesman, presented a declaration of thanks for religious liberty to the Vice Prime Minister Vasile Luca and Minister of Religion, Stanciu Stoian.

The document affirmed that liberty of conscience and religion was

guaranteed for the whole republic. The new Ministry of Religion had abolished ancient injustices which specially privileged Churches had created. One Church only in the past had enjoyed privileges above the others, and that Church, having displeased the Ministry, had no representative among the delegation that day. Elements inimical to the democracy had created unrest because of legislation on secularization of education, but the Government has punished offenders of religious liberty. The Government has realized a transformation, and has stopped the practice of one man exploiting another. It will not allow itself to be influenced by reactionary forces. It concludes with the statement that "We are grateful to the Regime and to the Government for the favors shown us and on our part we shall seek to sustain as far as possible the common effort of the whole people for the strengthening and the prosperity of our Fatherland, the Popular Rumanian Republic. (CIP)

### *SEPARATED RUMANIANS OF MACEDONIA BREAK RELATIONS WITH THE PATRIARCHATE OF BUCHAREST*

The Greek press informs that a part of the separated Orientals of Macedonia have broken relations with the Patriarchate of Bucharest. This minority presented a memorandum to the Metropolitan of Salonica requesting to be admitted as part of the Greek Church.

### *LAST TWO CATHOLIC BISHOPS ARRESTED*

Eleven Bishops have been seized in the last year of persecution in Rumania. There is now no Bishop left free to serve the needs of either the 1,200,000 Latin Rite or the 1,500,000 Greek Rite Catholics. The latest Bishops arrested are Bishops Aaron Marton of Alba Julia and Anton Durcovici of Jassi.

* * * *

## ALBANIA

### *PRESENT CONDITIONS*

Since 1945 an intense persecution of the Catholic Church has been carried on by the government of Envehr Hoxa. The Catholics, centered mostly in the north of the country, number about 113,000, or 10 per cent. of the population. Sixty-seven per cent. of the population is Mussulman, and the remainder dissident Orientals. The two archdioceses have their seat at Durazzo and Scutari.

The Italian Priests were expelled after the war. The Albanian Priests, in constant fear of arrest, remain there in miserable conditions. All Catholic schools are closed, Catholic Action is prohibited and the Catholic printing presses confiscated. Only one Bishop, Bishop Bernard Shlaku of Pulati, is

free. He was released from prison because of advanced age and poor health. Two of the Bishops have been executed, another was sentenced to 20 years' imprisonment. The Archbishop Gaspar Thaci of Scutari died in 1946 leaving the See vacant. Nuns have been forced to return to their families. While three churches in Tirana are opened at intervals, few attend.

Members of the dissident Oriental Church have been left relatively undisturbed. Many members of the government and of the Communist party belong to this Church. Pressure has been brought on the head of the separated Albanian Church to force him to submission to the Moscow Patriarch. He has courageously resisted this forced reunion.

* * * *

## TURKEY

### *PATRIARCH ATHENAGORAS I AND THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE*

Upon the initiative of Patriarch Athenagoras I, Msgr. Andrea Cassulo, Apostolic Delegate in Turkey, was invited to celebrate a religious function in the building of the Greek Consulate at Istanbul. This Patriarch of the separated Oriental Church had gone to present his felicitations to the Apostolic Delegate on the Coronation Anniversary of Pope Pius XII. In his first official discourse he had exhorted the faithful to collaborate with all the Churches, including the Roman Catholic Church.

### *GREATER RELIGIOUS TOLERANCE*

The National Assembly of Turkey has recently studied a series of projected laws concerning religious organizations. This present government has determined to observe greater religious tolerance. It is expected that while laws will remain against religious institutions which have influence on public affairs, the conditions of religious institutions will be greatly improved without however their obtaining complete liberty of action. (CIP)

* * * *

## RUSSIA

### *CHURCH OF ST. LOUIS DES FRANCAIS AT MOSCOW*

The Soviet Government has made Saint Louis des Français, sole Roman Catholic Church in Moscow, the center of an international entanglement. Fr. Laberge, Catholic chaplain to the American Colony at Moscow, formerly officiated there, but his visa was cancelled last year on a visit to the United States. Fr. Jean de Matha Thomas (Augustinian of the Assumption), attached to the French Embassy, who had obtained a visa in 1947 through the personal intervention of M. Bidault, the Foreign Minister, has had the charge of St. Louis, during the interim. After Fr. Laberge's visa was cancelled,

Fr. Arthur Brassard, A.A., was appointed in his place, but although he applied for his visa last February, and a request was made in May by the U. S. Under-Secretary of State to the Soviet Ambassador to expedite the matter, he is still in the United States awaiting a visa.

Now the Soviet Government has obliged Fr. Thomas to surrender the keys of the church and has given it into the charge of one Fr. Adamovich, a Latvian Catholic Priest, who is believed to have been rendered subservient to the Communist regime. He was assigned to Moscow by the Bishop Anton Springovic, Archbishop of Riga, who, very old and in bad health, is the only Catholic Bishop in Soviet territory to enjoy a measure of freedom.

The Soviet law demands that the church be maintained by an association *(Dvadtsatka)* of twenty Catholic lay people accepted by the authorities, who until recently were Poles and Lithuanians. The Soviet authorities rejected last year's *Dvadtsatka* which listed some foreign names and imposed its own list of all Soviet citizens. This *Dvadtsatka* confiscated the keys of the church. Fr. Thomas is now permitted to offer a "personal" Mass on week-days and one on Sunday for non-Russians only, chiefly of the Diplomatic Corps. Fr. Adamovich, whose presence is designed to give evidence of unrestrained religious practice in Russia, celebrates for any Russian Catholics who wish to risk the close surveillance to which the church and all who enter it are subjected.

St. Louis des Français was up until the Revolution the Catholic Church of the Diplomatic Corps in Moscow. At the time of the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States in 1933, President Roosevelt secured the right of having a Priest of American nationality serve this church for all Catholics both Russian and foreign. Wherefore the Soviet seizure of the church constitutes an offense involving American-Soviet relations. The French Ambassador in Moscow, however, has submitted several protests to the Soviet Government requesting a rectification of its hostile attitude toward this church of the Diplomatic Corps.

## *PASTORAL LETTERS TO UKRAINIAN CATHOLICS FROM SLAVE CAMPS*

The Bishops of the Ruthenian Catholic Church who were deported to Siberia during 1945 have written a Pastoral Letter which has been smuggled into Western Ukraine and Polish Galicia. Also the Metropolitan Slipyj of Lwow, head of the Ruthenian Hierarchy, has sent other letters by underground channels from the camp at Verkuta in the Arctic Circle. These letters, it is said by a refugee from Western Ukraine, have been read by thousands of Ukrainians who are clinging to their faith in spite of persecution.

# EGYPT

## *DEATH OF ARCHBISHOP HUGHES, APOSTOLIC NUNCIO TO EGYPT*

The news of the sudden death of the Most Rev. Msgr. Arthur Walter Hughes, W.F., titular Archbishop of Aprus, and Apostolic Internuncio to Egypt, an outstanding servant of the Church, brought sorrow to many. He died at the age of 47 on July 12 while visiting his family in Surrey, England.

Upon leaving school he entered the Catholic Church, and was received into the novitiate of the White Fathers in North Africa at the age of 17. He was ordained in 1927. In 1933 he was sent as secretary-general to the Catholic missions in Uganda. When war was declared with Italy he was made responsible for the Vicariate of the Equatorial Nile in Northern Uganda, and in 1943 was transferred as *Reggente* of the Apostolic Delegation in Egypt and Palestine which included responsibility for Transjordania and Cyprus. His principal duties took place in Egypt. He conducted negotiations which led to establishment of diplomatic relations between Egypt and the Holy See, before being promoted from Titular Bishop of Hieropolis to Archbishop and Internuncio in Cairo. In February, 1948, a new Apostolic Delegation in Jerusalem and Palestine, covering Transjordania and Cyprus, was established and Msgr. Hughes was able to devote himself entirely to the Church in Egypt. He was eminently successful in his labors, and secured great friendliness and mutual respect between Catholic communities and dissident Oriental and other bodies, as well as between Catholics and Moslems.

## *NEW BISHOP OF THEBES*

The Holy Father has named Most Reverend Isaac Ghattas, formerly Vicar General of the Patriarchate of the Copts of Alexandria, to the Residential Episcopal See of Thebes in Upper Egypt, within the Coptic Patriarchate of Alexandria.

Msgr. Isaac Ghattas, born in 1908, made his studies in the Copt Seminary of the Jesuit Fathers in Cairo, and in the Magor Copt Seminary in Tahta. He was ordained there on February 7, 1932. He became Vicar General of the Copt Patriarchate in Cairo in 1938.

The Eparchy of Thebes or Luxor (Tahta) after the erection of the new Diocese of Assiut, created and separated from that of Thebes in 1947, now numbers about 14,400 Catholics (among 228,000 dissidents), with 16 Priests There is a beautiful Cathedral, gift of Pius XI, and a fine Episcopal Palace and Seminary built through the generosity of Leo XIII. The Seminary was recently transferred to Tanta in Lower Egypt. A Preparatory Seminary remains at Tahta. (SICO)

## SYRIA

### *RELATIONS WITH THE HOLY SEE*

The Syrian Government has now established relations with the Holy See and has appointed Farid Chalawi, director of the consular department at the Syrian Ministry for Foreign Affairs, as Syrian diplomatic representative to the Holy See in the capacity of chargé d'affaires. Two other countries of the Near East, Egypt and Lebanon, already have full diplomatic relations with the Holy See, with Nunciatures in Cairo and Beyrouth.

The Syrian population, numbering 3,006,000, is composed mostly of Sunni Moslems. It comprises 730,000 Christians, of whom 375,200 are Catholics belonging to various Oriental rites.

### *THE APOSTOLIC CHURCHES OF THE EAST*

These of the Eastern Churches known as the Lesser Eastern Churches which are separated from Rome have reflected upon the events of Amsterdam. They had but two representatives there who felt somewhat lost in that large reunion. They have reviewed their position before the rest of the Christian world and have arrived at the conclusion that their Churches should make a common front and speak with a common voice to make themselves heard in ecumenical gatherings of an international sort.

Canon J. A. Douglas, addressing the St. John Damascene Society in London on April 7, stressed the need to know more about the Lesser Eastern Churches, their doctrine, rite and organization. He said that these Churches await their Charles Diehl or Francis Dvornik in order to be presented to the West as they really are. It was decided at Amsterdam to use for the spread of information concerning these churches the Malankara periodical "The Star of the East," Sasthamkotta, Adur P.O., Travancore, South India.

The above periodical (No. 1) prints an article by Rev. V. S. Kaloustian, Vicar of the (separated) Armenian Church of London, which states that the Apostolic Oriental Churches "are not Orthodox, nor Catholic nor Protestant. They are Churches which have their own proper tradition and an entirely independent ecclesiastical status. They are that which remains of the Churches which were in earlier times the glorious and prosperous Churches of the Near East, cradle of Christianity. They were founded either by the Apostles themselves or by their immediate disciples. They are: the Syrian Church, the Coptic Church of Egypt, the Coptic Church of Ethiopia, the Armenian Church, the Syrian Orthodox Church of Malabar in India." (S.OE.P.I.)

Certainly studies of the ancient Apostolic Churches, partly still separated from, partly now united with the See of Peter as they all were in the days of their golden age, will bring great inspiration and profit to the scholar,

and deepen that understanding which is required for the Christ-like work of unity.

* * * *

## INDIA

### *A 25th ANNIVERSARY, AND A 19th CENTENARY*

On December 21 last, the Cathedral and Parish churches of Syro-Malabar rite celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the establishment of its Hierarchy. It was instituted with the brief *Romani Pontifices* on December 21, 1923. It came into being with an Indian prelate at its head.

In the year 1952 the Malabar Churches will celebrate the nineteenth centenary of the foundation of Catholicism in that region by St. Thomas the Apostle. It is expected that an important relic of the Apostle will be brought to Malabar for that occasion, as the relic of St. Francis Xavier was brought to Japan for the recent celebrations there.

The Christians of St. Thomas are now divided into the *Jacobites* under the Patriarch of Antioch; Jacobites under the Catholicos (Maphrian) of Kottayam; the Martomites under the Metropolitan of Tiruvalla; Catholics in the ecclesiastical provinces of Ernakulam and Trivandrum; Protestants of the United Church of South India.

The greater part of the Jacobites depending upon the Catholicos of Kottayam look toward the Catholic Church as to a last refuge. From them have come the most numerous returns to unity. Such are the Catholics in the ecclesiastical province of Trivandrum, which number 58,537 faithful, 113 Priests, 34 Religious and 291 houses of worship.

The Diocese of Tiruvalla in the midst of central Travancore is at present administrated by an Apostolic Administrator, Mar Severios, who is extremely zealous in the work of reuniting the dissidents. Great importance and solemnity is given to the celebration of the Octave of Prayer for Unity. Mar Severios is hoping that the nineteenth centenary year will be one of great graces and will see the return of many to the one fold of Jesus Christ.

### *A COLLEGE AT TRIVANDRUM*

His Excellence Archbishop Mar Ivanios has announced the solemn inauguration of a college which he has erected to take place next July. The college is intended for Catholic youth of Syro-Malankar rite. It will bear the name of its illustrious founder, leader of the movement of return to the Fold of Peter which commenced with his submission to the Holy See on September 20, 1930.

## PALESTINE

### *INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE HOLY LAND*

The Holy Father on Good Friday published a new Encyclical Letter on Palestine entitled *Redemptoris Nostri* which presents a plan for "a true peace in that region so dear to the heart of every Christian," calls again for the internationalization of Jerusalem and its suburbs for the protection of the sacred shrine for Christianity, and for the defense of the rights which Catholics have acquired through many centuries in Palestine, "and which they have strenuously and many times defended—rights which the Sovereign Pontiffs have always solemnly and firmly reaffirmed."

Since that time we have learned from many countries that the Catholic Hierarchies are informing their faithful and pressing the cause of internationalization with their government in accordance with the Holy Father's direction to "give expression to their own wishes and rights, openly and decisively, to the rulers of the peoples."

The Near East Christian Council, representing Protestant missions and churches from the Balkans to Ethiopia, adopted a resolution at Beyrouth on April 27 that the greater Jerusalem area be placed under United Nations administration. The Near East and Reference and the Council Committee of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America representing the major Protestant denominations of North America, in behalf of the rights of the various peoples, rather than the shrines, have made a like statement. The Ecumenical Patriarch Athenagoras I of the separated Greek Church made an appeal for the internationalization of Jerusalem and the Holy Places to the United Nations. The realization of the sole basis of peace in that intense center of turmoil still lies ahead. Fr. Alberto Gori, O.F.M., Custodian of the Holy Land, writes to the Franciscan general in Rome: "The refusals to allow us to exercise our sacrosanct rights, the attempts and the actual invasions of our properties, the systematic refusal to grant our requests regarding the movement of our religious personnel, the open hostility against some of our religious brothers—perhaps because they still know how to defend and protect our rights because they know them and those rights of the poor people who are entrusted to their care—grieve us deeply.

"They take from us every confidence in a people who fundamentally should have a certain debt of gratitude since we exposed our lives in order to safeguard and protect them in recent times."

A Palestine correspondent of the international Fides agency, a Catholic who resided in Jerusalem throughout the conflict, writes the following on the political aspect of that city: ". . . a frenetic, 'illuminated' nationalism—even among those who call themselves atheists—through the conviction of an exceptional mission of the Jewish people, upheld by financial means which are prodigious in consideration of the smallness of Israel, has succeeded in

imposing its independence, its recognition by other countries, and it soon will its admission into the U.N.

"Triumphant Sionism becomes a grave menace for the continuation of Christianity in the Holy Land.

"Be it of a spiritual sort of inspiration, constituting an act of revenge against two thousand years' of Christianity, or be it atheistic and materialistic, and becomes the foment of Communism in the Near East, Sionism cannot tolerate under any form whatsoever any expression of Christ's doctrine upon 'its' land.

"Be they ever so reserved or masked, these menaces are clear to attentive eyes, to the point of bringing about unanimity of opinion among the Christians who have lived these last months in Israel." The writer continues with an exposition of the Messianic ambitions for the restoration of the Kingdom of David and the rebuilding of the Temple which appear to animate the anti-Christian activities.

The Government of Israel has declared willingness to permit a supervision of the Holy Places, but not internationalization. The Rabbi head of Israel, Dott. Isaac H. Herzog, proposed that an interconfessional committee be created for the protection of the Mussulman and Christian Holy Places at Jerusalem, but that the city should remain in the hands of the Israel Government.

At Lake Success, during the month of May, Israel was finally admitted as a member of the United Nations without any specific assurance that the General Assembly's resolutions of 1947 and 1948 demanding internationalization of Jerusalem and repatriation of Palestinian Arab refugees would ever be put into effect. These problems are expected to be settled by negotiations between the Conciliation Commission (composed of the United States, France and Turkey) and the Israel and the Arab states now in session at Lausanne. Since the Israel cause has been anything but weakened by its admission to the U.N. without first complying with the Assembly's demands of 1947 and 1948, observers fear that their position in Jerusalem will be further strengthened by next fall's meeting.

The delegations of the six Arab states of Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen walked out of the Assembly Hall to show their indignations of Israel's acceptance into the U.N. The general dissatisfaction with the Assembly's action and the air of political bargaining latent there was voiced by Dr. Charles Malike, delegate of Lebanon, who said: "What is at stake is not Jerusalem, nor the Arabs, nor the Jews, but the quality of Western Christian statesmanship."

* * * *

## JAPAN

### *SEPARATED JAPANESE CHRISTIANS*

On the island of Ikitsuki near Hirado the greater part of the 12,000

inhabitants are Christians called "Hanare" who declined to return to the Church when they were discovered among the 50,000 "lost Catholics" in the region of Nagasaki in 1865. The reason for their reticence, according to a Japanese Priest, is principally the obstinacy of their leaders who fear the loss of their prestige. About 500 of the Hanares have since returned to their Church.

A non-Christian scholar of Hirado recently discovered a small box in the keeping of a Hanare family. It had not been opened since the days of the early persecutions. He persuaded the family to open it in view of the fourth centenary celebration of Catholicism, and the elders of the village gathered in the house to open the box with prayers and ceremonies. It contained a bronze relief of the Blessed Virgin, a Crucifix, a medal dated 1630, and a chain of glass, supposedly a rosary, to which was attached another medal. An inscription on this medal reads: "Benedictum sit S. Sacramentum." Since it is above all the Blessed Sacrament which the Hanares lack, the medal bears a salutary message for them.

## *CORPORATE CONVERSIONS IN JAPANESE TOWNS*

The village of Sage, which a short time ago decided to enter the Church as a body, is proceeding swiftly to adopt its new Christian life. A group of 12 boys followed by a group of 38 girls had received the Sacrament of Baptism in May. Bishop Paul Taguchi of Osaka expects to bring most of the 3,000 inhabitants into the Church in a relatively short time by baptizing small groups weekly. The villagers have converted a large hall into a church, and are planning a larger one. They have formed their own choir, they provide for all the needs of a Priest and catechist, and say the family rosary daily in their homes.

Mizu, a town of 9,000 pagans, has requested the missioners of the Immaculate Heart of Mary to bring them the faith, and have promised to provide a church and rectory in the "best place in town" as well as a large apartment house for Sisters. When the Superior General of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Congregation visited them, the whole town appeared to receive him in public welcome and celebration.

Four towns and villages on the outskirts of Kyoto now have the nucleus of a Catholic parish. Their respective mayors had requested Priests to instruct their people. Groups in three other villages and in two suburbs of Kyoto have asked for instruction. Thus the St. Francis Parish in Kyoto now has a total of nine dependent missions. In one town where proper accommodations were lacking, permission was accorded to a Priest to teach in the local Shinto shrine.

# Book Reviews

*Eglise Vivante; Réponse à l'attente des peuples.* A quarterly review; Louvain, 1949, Tome I, No. 1.

A new review has been created to increase the surge toward religious unity which distinguishes our day. It focuses its efforts upon the missionary phase of the Church's life. This quarterly is entitled *Eglise Vivante; Réponse à l'attente des peuples* (Living Church; Response to the Expectation of the Peoples). It is published at Louvain under the direction of the Société des Auxiliaires des Missions.

In the explanatory preface which opens the pages of this first number one senses a fresh and dynamic spirit in the field of ecclesiastical thought. *Eglise Vivante* wishes to contribute as its part in the "present renewal of Ecclesiology, to the study of the theological foundations of the missionary life of the Church," and this in an integrally Catholic spirit. It feels that the young Christianities should communicate their invigorating new experiences to the old and "strive to make felt the breath of the Spirit which animates each cell of the one Body of Christ."

To speed the flow of charitable intercourse between the many peoples *Eglise Vivante* will emphasize the cultural life of our distant brothers. It will "attempt to make known and enjoy, in all human cultures, the richness of the varied gifts which God has distributed among men." The review will even deal with regional cultures as such. We read further below: "In the transfiguration of the world which the Church has as its task, human cultures have their place. While we await their assimilation, we should learn to appreciate them." By way of example it refers to an article in the present number devoted to the popular songs of Viet-Nam which should serve to acquaint us with a distant family of our brothers in Christ through their poetical genius. Indeed it is the intimate soul of a people which speaks when they sing.

The Church gains a sort of richness when she gives from her treasure of the faith. She becomes richer in wisdom and sentiment through a more exhaustive acquaintance with the unendingly varied marvels wrought by those human souls which a divine Creator fashioned in His image. It could be said that since each nation excels in refracting some particular hue of the one Light, each lends to the universe of the faithful a new aspect, and a fuller view of that infinite white Light Who enlightens all men.

Perhaps the role of cultural interest and understanding in the Church's missionary endeavor has been underestimated and left under-developed. The urgency of mutual understanding in imparting Christ's doctrine is evident. Moreover it would be unworthy of us to spurn the cultural offering which a people brings with it when they join us in the Church—an offering which represents centuries of sacrifice and intelligent effort. Yet all these things, be they ever so precious, have real value and goodness only insofar as they

are purified and enlightened by the Faith. We may not permit their fascination to draw our all too human eyes from the proper scope of missionary activity: to extend the Kingdom of God and to carry Christ's means of salvation to all men. Cultural splendor enhances the Church, indeed, but only indirectly and secondarily does it serve to reveal the luster of the Pearl of Great Price, the Faith, which is the Spouse's single treasure.

But this modern-day publication steps forward boldly. It does not recoil before an almost insuperable problem. It informs us that it would also "make known the missionary activities of our separated brothers *in one spirit and one hope of unity.*" If it succeeds in this, it will have succeeded where many wise and holy men have failed. At the same time such a deliberate intention bears a certain hopefulness because of its striking likeness to a similar inspiration which we might say launched the ecumenical movement on a world scale among non-Catholics. The idea of a world conference of churches was born in the heart of Charles Henry Brent, Episcopal Bishop of the Philippines, whose initial urge arose from the will to resolve strife in the missionary field. It was he who first proposed a world conference to a diocesan convention at Cincinnati in the United States in 1910. Such a gigantic project demanded supreme courage before the reality of the Protestant divergences. A like inspiration for missionary accord on the part of a Catholic group will rather demand an infinity of prudence before their sacred trust of revealed truth. Our priests are divinely commissioned to impart and defend the doctrine Christ confided solely to the Living Church of His establishment. Christ has left no trace of an intention to complete His authentic Church with a super-church of freer belief and more transcendent inspiration. Hence He has left no authority to His ministers to cooperate with those who would teach another church or dissimilar doctrine. How then is this ideal to develop? How to respect the all-holy truth of Christ, and at the same time join hands amicably in one spirit of unity with those who, however edifying their subjective good will, objectively teach a reduced and erroneous version of it and on their own authority strive to lead His sheep away into folds which are not His?

Father Maurice Villain deals with this question in his article *Esprit oecuménique et esprit missionnaire* on page 114. Against the dissension caused by rivalry, we may rival the Protestant missionaries and respect them too if we try to out-do them in the practice of virtue. We may effect a certain spiritual unity by praying for one another. We may aspire toward the realization of full union by instructing the faithful in the cause of Unity, and by organizing prayers for Unity within the missions. We may even cooperate with non-Catholics in a friendly way on the practical social level.

We await with great interest the development which *Eglise Vivante*

will bring to this delicate problem of relations with our separated brothers—which we would see grow ever stronger in Christ.

This number of *Eglise Vivante* presents an interesting table of contents: J. Bruls, *Perspectives de catholicité;* J. Monchanin, *La crise de l'espérance;* J. François, *Dom Lou Tseng Tsiang;* P. Goffart, *La genèse des idées missionnaires du Père Lebbe;* Th. Georges, *Importance mondiale de la Chine;* P. Hardaparmaka, *Conscience nationale et catholicisme en Indonésie;* Msgr. Fernandez (lecture), *Christ-Nagar, Cité du Christ;* Chronicles: *Le monde missionnaire catholique en 1948;* Chretiens séparés: M. Villain, *Esprit oecuménique et esprit missionnaire;* J. Tombeur, *L'activité missionaire protestante;* Book reviews.

SALVATOR BUTLER, S.A.

* * * *

B. C. Joannides, *The First Assembly of the Union of Churches at Amsterdam,* Mich. Triantapyllos, Salonica, 1949.

In a booklet of twenty-five pages, Mr. Basil Joannides makes a report for the dissident Greeks on the Assembly of the World Council of Churches held at Amsterdam between August 22 and September, 1948. He describes the spirit in which his compatriots entered into the activities. Even though they do approve the common practical solutions, they do not intend to subscribe to any compromise on the dogmatic differences. They fully acquiesce to the words of Florovsky: "The accord on temporal problems is a unity *in dubiis.* The accord on heavenly problems is a dissension *in necesariis.*" It is not befitting to speak of Unity of Churches without dogmatic unity. Actually, the Greco-Russian Churches desire through participation in ecumenism to bring the Protestant Churches into contact with the seven first councils.

The basis of participation: Jesus Christ, God and Savior "implies the Incarnation and the Redemption. Yet the formula remains vague, and discussions were needed in the Ecumenical movement to limit the sense of it and at the same time keep the door open to as many Churches as possible." "But," the author adds (p. 14), "in our opinion the door would not have been closed on many Churches if we had required belief in the Holy Trinity and Baptism; we would have confessed better those essential characters of the faith which a Christian Church ought to require of its members on principle."

Another reservation arose from the fact that the Ecumenical Council or the Society of Churches is a new institution for the ecclesiastical life of the dissident Greco-Russian Church which comprises the autocephalic Churches under obedience to the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. The statutes of the new organ present important problems which the synods of the Greek Churches have not yet examined or resolved. Moreover (p. 16), the participation of the Greco-Russian Churches in the Council is not in

suitable proportions. Only the Ecumenical Patriarch of the Hellenic Church sent legates. The Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the Churches of Russia, Serbia, Rumania and Bulgaria all abstained. The reason is doubtless to be accounted for by the situation of the Greco-Russian Churches. A certain number of them are attempting to withdraw themselves from the authority of the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople whom they would see eclipsed by the Patriarch of Moscow. For all these reasons, the dissident oriental delegates participated in the discussions with this restriction that they did not subscribe to any of the eventual decisions without first having submitted them to the examination of their synods.

This is the spirit in which they took part in the activities. At the end they joined in a common declaration affirming their satisfaction and their gratitude for the cordial spirit which reigned in all the discussions. There is but one reservation: the expositions and the developments of dogmatic questions. Even though the difficulty of an accord on these questions be great indeed, the spirit of their Church requires an exact, clear interpretation which does not lend itself to erroneous interpretations. May the Almighty deign to complete the work, by leading all the dissident churches into their own which they claim to be orthodox. It is only within it, the author believes, that union is possible.

He concludes with an exhortation to the Greco-Russians. He asks them to intensify their activity among the members of the Ecumenical Council. They need first of all a permanent synodic council for ecumenical affairs which would work in close cooperation with the professors of the Faculties of Theology. Their efforts thus coordinated would bear fruit in the Ecumenical Council itself. They could contribute their influence through some secretarial office of the sort provided for in the statutes, and which they should strive to obtain.

SEBASTIEN FRANKEN

* * * *

## *THE PHOTIAN SCHISM—History and Legend*

By FRANCIS DVORNIK, Cambridge University Press, 1948. 504pp.

The significance of the subtitle Prof. Dvornik gives to this work is at once evident from the subject of a conference given by him at the Oxford *Church Unity Week* (1942): *The Patriarch Photius—Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion.* The common view, practically unquestioned until Dvornik's studies, would make of Photius a chief author of the schism effectively unrepaired since the eleventh century. But such a view, the author maintains, is the result of a legend grown up in the west since the eleventh century. The rise and growth of this legend occupies the second part of the book. The real history of the schism under Photius, with which the first

part of the book is concerned, makes possible a just appreciation of the great ecclesiastic that was Photius. That he be termed also "Patron of Reunion" does not enter the scope of this book, whose scope is to set forth the historical facts, but arises from the fact that while allowing to the elder Rome a true and proper primacy Photius yet maintained that view of the one Church which gives the national element a large and assured place in its juridical and liturgical structure. These latter ideas Dvornik has developed in the above mentioned conference and in the important essay: *National Churches and the Church Universal* appearing in the *Eastern Churches Quarterly* for 1943 (pp. 172-219; published also separately).

The history redresses the legend. The critical points at which Dvornik redresses the Photian legend are the following: The anti-Photian councils of 863 and 869 at Rome and the Constantinopolitan synod of 869-70 were not only annulled by the synod of 879-80 at Constantinople, but the annulment was approved by Pope John VIII. The synod therefore of 869-70 has no title to ecumenicity. The appellation of this synod of 869-70 as the 8th ecumenical council is due to a confusion of western canonists towards the end of the eleventh century. Further, the second schism of Photius never existed. The patriarch died therefore in peace and communion with the Holy See.

The unity of the book is that of a dominant theme. For various chapters (part I, chapter 2, page 39ff.; part II, chapter 1 and 2, page 279ff., 309ff.) are substantial reproductions of special studies previously published. Elsewhere also the text is a reproduction of earlier work, calling attention only in the footnotes to subsequent studies (as page 126, note 2, on the allegedly Photian treatise against the Roman primacy). This lack of literary unity is due to the way in which the work grew and to the difficulties of the times, as the author explains in his preface (page xii).

In any case all friends of union will be delighted at having the substance of Professor Dvornik's various studies available in one volume. The results of these studies may be accepted with greater confidence in that they do not now appear for the first time, but have already been subjected to the criticism of experts. The ample bibliography at the end of the volume refers to many of these critical reviews; see for example the items cited under *Grumel*.

One of the by-products of the book is the light shed on the conditions at the papal and imperial courts where partial and misinformation played, along with political maneuvering (e.g., the Bulgarian question), such a great part in the conservation and loss of Christian unity.

DOM POLYCARP SHERWOOD, O.S.B.

---

Note: *Unitas* will print further studies of this monumental and unusually significant work in future editions.